

EUR Institutional Policy for Quality Assurance in Education

'Connecting & Improving'

2025-2029

Adopted by the Executive Board on [date]

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Good education requires continuous reflection: Are we doing the right things? Are we doing things right? These two questions form the foundation of quality assurance at Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR). In a world changing faster than ever, it is essential that we as an educational institution remain agile and purposeful. The expectations of students, the labour market and society are changing accordingly – and so is what is expected of good education. With this quality assurance policy for the period 2025–2029, we anchor the first question (Are we doing the right things?) more explicitly in our internal system. This is important for a university that makes responsiveness an integral part of its mission. The second question (Are we doing things right?) has always been central during programme evaluations and accreditations and remains important.

'Quality dialogues' are highly valued at EUR: open, critical conversations about education aimed at improving that education. In recent years, we have taken important steps in this regard. For example, in 2023 our joint educational vision was established – a process in which staff, students and administrators from across the institution were actively involved. At faculty and programme level, a strong quality culture has grown, supported by lecturers, educational management, support staff and involved bodies. At these levels too, there is broad reflection on objectives, their alignment with stakeholder needs, and the manner in which they are implemented. This foundation is strong, and we are building on it.

At the same time, we identify opportunities to further connect and strengthen existing dialogue structures. Consider optimizing the coherence between internal reflection and external accountability; and between cycles at central and decentralized levels. Or consider making the outcomes of dialogues even more visible to learn from each other. Our impact ambitions require connecting structures that facilitate institution-wide collaboration, enable stakeholder involvement, and help us realize our own goals. It is important that we maintain and – where possible – strengthen the adaptive capacity of the organization.

This document describes the vision and principles for quality assurance policy at EUR and translates these into a framework for establishing governance of quality assurance and a quality assurance system that can support our culture. With this renewed policy, we specify how we handle an important transition in our approach to quality assurance: towards a development-oriented approach with room for autonomy. This requires conscious and competent quality assurance practices at all levels. Investing in leadership and mastery in quality assurance and strengthening decentralized ownership therefore form the core of this policy. In this way, we work towards a future-proof quality assurance practice in which continuous improvement and asking the right questions remain central.

1.1 Purpose and function of institutional policy

The institutional policy for quality assurance in education is intended as a framework document for all those involved at EUR in the development and assurance of education: administrators, management, lecturers, support staff, students, representative bodies and examination boards. The document:

- Explicates EUR's vision on quality assurance and describes how this vision relates to the educational vision and the institutional plan
- Establishes the responsibilities for quality assurance of different actors and bodies at different levels within the institution
- Defines the quality assurance cycle and the coherence between different cycles, and the importance and role of dialogues within them
- Specifies the instruments used to monitor, evaluate and improve quality
- Provides frameworks for faculties and programmes to organize their own quality assurance system

1.2 Reading guide

The second chapter describes core concepts, vision and principles that form the basis of this policy.

In the subsequent chapters, the principles described in Chapter 2 form the common thread through the description of:

- The governance of the institution (Ch. 3) and specification of roles, responsibilities and core tasks regarding quality assurance (Ch. 4)
- The quality assurance cycles at different levels within EUR, in mutual coherence (Ch. 5)
- An overview of dialogue structures within EUR, both horizontal and vertical, in mutual coherence (Ch. 6), and finally
- An overview of instruments that can be deployed to feed those dialogues, with specific attention to institution-wide, connecting instruments (Ch. 7)

1.3 Scope of this policy

This policy relates to EUR's accredited programme portfolio: bachelor's and master's programmes, initial and post-initial.

1.4 Contact

For questions or comments about this document, please contact the Education & Quality Assurance Team within Academic Affairs, via kwalityteitszorg.onderwijs@eur.nl.

2. Core concepts, vision and principles

Connection between internal and external quality concepts

EUR defines what it considers good education through its educational vision. The Dutch Higher Education and Research Act (WHW - Wet op het Hoger Onderwijs en Wetenschappelijk onderzoek, the main law governing Dutch higher education) and the accreditation framework clarify how the government and supervisory authority view educational quality. We organize the quality assurance of our education in such a way that it contributes to achieving our own goals while simultaneously meeting external requirements. The external assessment framework explicitly invites this: it is built on 'open standards' that are filled in based on the institution's quality concept. The open nature of the framework emphasizes the institution's autonomy and own responsibility for quality, and allows room for variation in implementation and organization of educational policy. It also emphasizes how important it is to engage in dialogue about educational quality. This aligns with the approach we use within EUR. With this revised institutional policy, we make this room for autonomy and ownership explicit and anchor it further.

The EUR educational vision: a shared vision on good education

The educational vision translates EUR's mission to the educational domain: within EUR we consider good education as education that trains students to become global citizens who can make a positive societal impact. In doing so, we focus on impact-driven education that addresses current societal urgencies, within an inclusive and challenging learning environment. Important principles of the didactic framework are working on authentic challenges, stakeholder involvement in education and an inter-/transdisciplinary approach. With Strategy 2030, we focus on further development towards a more engaged approach to impact-driven education, characterized by more extensive and reciprocal interaction between students and external stakeholders. Organized around our impact domains, we connect partners, stakeholders, researchers and students in interdisciplinary learning networks. Embedding our education in these networks means that students can make an impactful contribution while learning, while further developing their impact capacities.

Operationalization of programme quality

As an institution, we primarily determine ourselves, in mutual dialogue between those involved, which goals we prioritize in shaping our education. In determining those goals and specifying them at programme level, we account for our societal responsibility and stakeholder needs and apply solid educational insights. In this way, we arrive at an operationalization of programme quality along three lines:

Responsiveness is the programme's ability to adequately respond to needs, expectations and contexts of different stakeholders through adaptability and customization. Students, society and the professional field are the most important stakeholders.

Strategic alignment is the extent to which a programme's mission, vision and goals are aligned with the institution's mission, vision and goals. Programme, faculty and institution work together in such a way that these goals – in the sum of activities – are realized.

Effective educational design is based on the application of evidence-based educational theory, including the principle of 'constructive alignment'. Through effective educational design, we ensure the degree-worthiness of the programme completed by students.

Connection between supervision at programme and institutional level

In the supervision of programme quality, the aspect of effective educational design is central. In programme accreditation according to the 'limited framework' (within the Dutch

accreditation system), the panel assesses the constructive alignment and realized programme quality. This assessment is based on the goals formulated by the programme itself and is validated by assessment of final theses/projects. The starting point of this assessment is explicitly that the vision, objectives and choices of the programme, insofar as they are in line with the standards that apply in the field, form the starting point and are not themselves subject to assessment. Within the internal quality assurance system, examination boards have the legal task of ensuring the quality of testing and examination and verifying that students achieve the intended final level.

The two other quality aspects of strategic alignment and responsiveness largely fall outside the scope of programme accreditation panels and examination boards, but are central in the context of the Institutional Quality Assurance Assessment (ITK - Instellingstoets Kwaliteitszorg, a Dutch institutional-level accreditation instrument). In the ITK, we demonstrate that our internal quality assurance – in the collaboration between institutional, faculty and programme level – is organized in such a way that we ensure educational quality on all three aspects. For institutions without a positive ITK decision, the 'extended framework' applies for programme accreditation, in which the aspects of strategic alignment and responsiveness are included in the external assessment of educational quality at programme level.

Systematic attention to educational development and improvement

Quality assurance at EUR is primarily aimed at stimulating development rather than controlling and ensuring minimum standards. Quality assurance is a means by which a programme or institution can steer towards what it considers important for profiling and improving its education. Quality assurance is thus inextricably linked to (line responsibility for) the primary process. Our approach to quality improvement is based on an appreciative inquiry approach, aimed at identifying and further developing existing strengths. Moreover, well-designed quality assurance not only means that the right actions are taken to develop and ensure the quality of education, but also that this happens systematically and with appropriate stakeholder involvement.

We therefore give our quality assurance a cyclical form, in a continuous succession of moments of reflection and moments of acting on the insights gained. Our quality assurance activities are organized around two core questions: Are we doing the right things, and are we doing things right? Three follow-up questions provide depth: How do we know? Do our stakeholders think so too? What do we do with that knowledge? Facilitating dialogue and feedback loops with stakeholders is therefore essential. Depending on the answer to these questions, actions can be taken in two directions: aimed at optimizing the way we implement our goals (exploitation) or aimed at recalibrating those goals (exploration). The strength of our internal quality assurance lies in embedding this dual orientation in our governance, system and culture.

A strong quality culture

Effective quality assurance assumes synergy between system and culture: the quality assurance system influences the behaviour and attitude of those involved and vice versa. Cultural aspects are anchored in daily interactions between all involved and are stimulated by leadership that demonstrates exemplary behaviour and promotes the shared vision. The quality assurance system is designed in such a way that it has a stimulating effect on the development of a strong quality culture. On the other hand, an existing quality culture is conditional for the proper functioning of a development-oriented approach and the success of autonomy.

Within EUR, we understand a strong quality culture as a culture characterized by:

- A shared and lived vision and underlying values
- A shared responsibility for quality at all levels

- A constructive-critical attitude aimed at continuous improvement
- An open dialogue between all involved about the quality of education
- Valuing and utilizing different perspectives
- Transparency about goals and results
- Systematic organization of feedback loops and follow-up of signals
- A learning community in which innovation and experimentation are stimulated
- Celebrating successes and recognizing good practices

The EUR quality assurance vision: a shared vision on the role of quality assurance

In our quality assurance vision, critical reflection and dialogue and the importance we attach to transparency and openness to different perspectives are central. In dialogue with each other and with stakeholders, we connect concrete goals to the open standards of the accreditation framework with our educational vision as starting point. The Executive Board, together with the connecting, collective leadership of deans and vice-deans of education, provides direction to strategic policy, while at the same time giving room to autonomy and ownership at faculty and programme level.

3. Governance

3.1 Governance model

The governance model describes how the university is organized and how decision-making takes place regarding educational quality. A clear governance model is essential for effective quality assurance. Erasmus University Rotterdam has two governance levels in its main structure: the institutional level and the level of faculties and services. The governance structure of EUR is laid down in the university's Governance and Management Regulations (BBR - Bestuurs- en Beheersreglement). The faculty governance organization is further elaborated in the Faculty Regulations and Management Instructions of each faculty. An up-to-date overview of these is available via the EUR website.

Administrative responsibility for educational quality

The Executive Board (CvB - College van Bestuur) has integral final responsibility for the governance and management of the university. Deans act as – single-headed – governance and as administrators of the relevant faculty. Deans have their own legal governance powers regarding the content of education and scientific practice. This expresses the faculty's autonomy. In addition, they perform mandated management tasks under the responsibility of the Executive Board as laid down in the BBR.

At faculty level, therefore, substantive and policy choices are made, and resources are allocated to realize this substantive policy. The faculty has its own responsibility regarding the content and design of education. However, the Executive Board as competent authority is ultimately externally accountable for the quality of education. The Executive Board can therefore issue guidelines for the coordination and organization of education: substantive and policy choices at faculty level must fit within the frameworks of strategic policy. The dean accounts for this to the Executive Board.

Within EUR's governance model, vice-deans of education play an important role. Deans assign governance tasks to vice-deans of education as laid down in the Faculty Regulations. A number of vice-deans of education also have sub-mandated management tasks, laid down via Management Instructions. The dean has the legal mandate to provide for the governance of programmes within the faculty portfolio (WHW Art. 9.17). Within EUR, this takes the form of a programme director. This task assignment is also regulated in the Faculty Regulations.

One connected EUR

EUR has traditionally been strongly decentrally organized, with a high degree of autonomy for faculties and various mechanisms that promote interaction between the different layers within the organization. In its new strategy, EUR has set itself the goal of operating as one connected EUR and realizes this through strengthened leadership, collaboration and efficient structures. This means that in our organization we continue to cherish the room for faculty autonomy while even more emphasis is placed on collective action and mutual learning on joint policy themes. For education, our joint educational vision determines the course.

Within this governance model, working on educational quality is considered a joint responsibility of all actors in the educational process. The focus on implementing the educational vision through independent faculty policy shifts to elaboration of joint policy themes in institution-wide frameworks. This is developed in co-creation with representatives from faculties in thematic working groups and task forces. Important in this governance model is the connecting, collective leadership of deans and vice-deans of education, supported by an expert administrative line.

Good practice: Erasmian leadership profile

The Erasmian leadership profile offers a common frame of reference that can be applied in various processes at EUR, from recruitment and selection to evaluation and development. The profile elaborates four core principles (1. Be a role model; 2. Facilitate and involve others; 3. Inspire with vision and 4. Manage for results) in associated competencies at three levels of leadership: (1. Personal leadership; 2. Leading others and 3. Leading an organization). The profile was developed in collaboration with representatives from faculties and services and tested with researchers with expertise in leadership. All faculties and services use the profile.

3.2 Collective leadership and mastery

In addition to their responsibility in faculty governance, as described in the next chapter, vice-deans of education play an important role in preparing institution-wide decision-making regarding education. They are united in the interfaculty body of vice-deans of education, in which direction is given to education-related policy development based on an annual work agenda and portfolio distribution. The collective vice-deans of education advise the Executive Board on the spending agenda of the central Quality Funds. They also jointly lead the institution-wide part of the implementation agenda of the Community for Learning & Innovation (see 3.3) and oversee its implementation.

Topics on the agenda of the vice-deans of education are discussed in advance in the Education Workshop (Onderwijsatelier), a monthly consultation structure between the education and quality assurance policy advisors of Academic Affairs and the various faculties. The Education Workshop thus also functions as an administrative antechamber for the body of vice-deans of education. In addition, the Education Workshop fulfills a role in facilitating policy implementation in faculties and stimulating mutual learning by providing a platform for exchange of good practices and ensuring the outcomes of that exchange through a working group structure in facilitating guidelines, tools and formats.

3.3 Community approach and CLI

In addition to connecting leadership, an important role is reserved for institution-wide communities in which exchange and collaboration takes place across faculty boundaries on (often vision-driven) institution-wide themes. In the communities, those involved come together from diverse expertise, roles and responsibilities. These communities are in principle separate from formal governance; they operate across formal organizational structures and unite those involved around shared challenges or interests and from intrinsic motivation for developing and improving education. Characteristic is strong involvement of students and external stakeholders. In these contexts, collective meaning-making and professional identity formation through knowledge sharing via stories and practical examples is central. In this way, common themes are charged and made concrete from the bottom up, from the full breadth of the organization, and in dialogue with an outside perspective.

In the previous strategic period, this process of collective meaning-making and commitment to an institution-wide implementation agenda was driven by a number of central strategic programmes and projects on core themes and the Community for Learning & Innovation (CLI), a hub focused on supporting and developing innovation capacity. In the new strategic period, focus is brought to these various initiatives by having the majority of these programmes and projects land in the CLI. Within the CLI and strategic programmes, active collaboration takes place with strategic leadership, lecturers, educational management, policy advisors and learning innovators in faculties, ensuring connection between educational innovation and improvement activities in faculties and the institution-wide educational vision.

Good practice: CLI Fellowships

The Executive Board makes resources available for educational innovation in faculties, including through CLI Fellowships. A productive and sustainable balance between developing and improving requires more than just intrinsic motivation of those involved in education in a bottom-up approach. EUR makes work of anchoring the dual orientation on exploitation and exploration in the educational organization through targeted financial support of lecturers in developing, implementing and investigating the impact of innovations. Fellows can use the facilities and expertise within the CLI community and share their results here. Successful experiments can thus grow into structural additions to our education, with empirical substantiation of their added value.

The CLI and strategic programmes are led by academic leads, who fulfill a dual function as substantive leader and governance liaison, primarily to the vice-deans of education. The programmes work along the lines of established programme plans. The collective vice-deans of education coordinate (the majority of) the CLI's work agenda, based on periodic reassessment and prioritization of their collective substantive ambitions. To realize responsiveness and agility, part of the CLI's deployment is intended to support specific faculty innovations on a project basis and part for open innovation. Important outcomes and lessons learned are reported by the CLI to the vice-deans of education. The academic lead operating within the CLI on the theme of impact and engagement also serves as Strategic Dean of Impact & Engagement in an advisory role to the Executive Board and deans.

3.4 Collaboration with external partners

As a university with pronounced impact and engagement ambitions, EUR depends on relationships with external partners and stakeholders to realize its mission. These collaborations are shaped at all levels: at the level of course, programme, faculty and institution. The next chapter under 4.4 Societal and professional field advisory councils describes how external stakeholder involvement in quality assurance is implemented at different levels (and specifically reflection on the dimension of responsiveness), as happens for example within the institution-wide Societal Advisory Council. The following paragraph describes different types of collaboration with external partners and/or stakeholders in and for education. For each of these types of collaboration, it applies that clear agreements about mutual expectations and any mutual obligations must be properly recorded, but it is just as important that continuous attention is paid to developing a culture of collaboration and trust.

Strategic collaboration with other (higher) education institutions

Both at central and decentralized level, there is participation in local, regional and (inter-)national strategic partnerships and alliances with other (higher) education institutions to facilitate collaboration in education towards shared strategic (educational) goals. An example is the joint development and delivery of educational programmes in various forms. Both within the context of these strategic partnerships and alliances and in more incidental collaboration constructs, mobility of staff and students is facilitated.

Good practice: Convergence

Together with Erasmus MC, EUR is involved in the Convergence EUR-TU Delft-Erasmus MC established in 2019, where the ultimate goal is to create societal impact with the region as a living lab. In the framework agreement, signed in 2021, agreements about operations within Convergence are laid down which are coordinated from the Convergence Office. For Convergence, a separate governance structure has been established with a Convergence Executive Board and Convergence Supervisory Board, in which the chair of EUR's Supervisory Board has a seat.

Joint educational development with other higher education institutions in the accredited programme portfolio takes many forms. Collaboration can take place at the level of a CROHO-registered programme (CROHO is the Dutch Central Register of Higher Education

Programmes), or at the level of a specialization or track within a programme. The faculty can also act as supplier for part of the education in a programme for which a degree is awarded by the other institution, or the contribution can be so substantial that a degree can (also) be connected to this on behalf of EUR. A collaboration can also lead to different types of degree conferral. We distinguish 'joint education' in the sense of WHW Art. 7.3c from so-called 'double degree programmes'.

Joint education versus dual degree programmes

Dual degree programmes refer to two programmes that are offered in parallel or consecutively and are partly aligned, but where there are essentially independent (and separately accredited) programmes to which separate degrees and diplomas are attached. EUR's responsibility for educational quality is then limited to the programme for which it awards a degree.

For programmes in the category of joint education in the sense of WHW Art. 7.3c (joint programmes), it concerns an integrated curriculum, where institutions jointly bear responsibility for quality. However, EUR's Executive Board remains accountable at all times for the entirety of the programme. This requires careful recording of mutual agreements regarding, among other things, governance, curriculum, educational organization, funding and tuition fees, accreditation and quality assurance.

WHW Art. 7.3c describes which matters must at least be recorded in a collaboration agreement. The EUR Guidelines for Joint Programmes describe various issues and points of attention in the design, organization and implementation of this type of educational collaboration.

Collaboration agreements should as a rule go through the FLAT ('Finance, Legal, Audit and Tax') check procedure, in which the proposed obligations are assessed on financial, legal, audit-technical and fiscal aspects. In 2023, an institution-wide framework was formulated for initiating, strengthening and evaluating international academic partnerships, as a result of the EUR Policy Framework 2021-2024. Responsibility for implementation lies with faculties. In 2024-2025, a committee has also been established that advises the Executive Board and deans, solicited and unsolicited, regarding handling (potentially) sensitive partnerships. This concerns collaboration with (academic and non-academic) partners that takes place in a context of conflict or debate.

Collaboration with societal partners, business and industry

Within EUR, there is also collaboration with societal partners, business and industry. Traditionally, these collaborations are primarily research-oriented, but with the transition to engaged, impact-driven education, this type of collaboration is also increasingly becoming part of the design of the teaching and learning environment. In addition to more institutional forms of collaboration at 'macro level', these connections are often also made at the level of a course, by an individual lecturer and/or student. This type of connection at 'micro level' can consist, for example, of a guest lecture, contributed case, or an internship and/or graduation assignment. Various forms of support are available from the strategic programme Impact at the Core (now embedded in the CLI) for lecturers and students regarding collaboration with external stakeholders.

Although the lecturer and examiner have an important role in organizing this type of collaboration and in supervising and assessing the student, with due regard for their professional autonomy, there are a number of aspects they must take into account. In addition to the outcomes of committees such as the aforementioned advisory committee on Sensitive Partnerships and the Committee of Experts on Fossil Industry, this concerns, for example, ensuring that students meet 'regular' requirements regarding scientific integrity, ethics and/or GDPR compliance in data processing, which can come under extra pressure in the context of such collaborations with external parties. At faculty and/or programme level, (domain-specific) guidelines are developed for this, for example in the context of internship

and thesis manuals. At institutional level, Erasmus Research Services (ERS) is preparing a framework for ethical review of research by students.

Development point: More structural collaboration within ecosystems

As an engaged university, EUR focuses on more structural and multilateral collaboration between academic and non-academic partners. Characteristic of this type of collaboration is the equality of partners within the knowledge and innovation ecosystem of which they are part. The regional ecosystem around EUR is strongly dominated by the port with all connected business activity and the presence of a super-diverse city in which major societal transition challenges are at play.

Organized around our impact domains and concrete challenges from the environment, we connect various partners with stakeholders, researchers and students in interdisciplinary learning networks. The ambition to embed student learning in these network contexts and have them collaborate with various parties raises questions, not only about the governance of such collaboration but also about adequate supervision and assessment of student learning in inherently open, complex learning situations.

3. Governance

3.1 Governance model

The governance model describes how the university is organized and how decision-making takes place regarding educational quality. A clear governance model is essential for effective quality assurance. Erasmus University Rotterdam has two governance levels in its main structure: the institutional level and the level of faculties and services. The governance structure of EUR is laid down in the university's Governance and Management Regulations (BBR - Bestuurs- en Beheersreglement). The faculty governance organization is further elaborated in the Faculty Regulations and Management Instructions of each faculty. An up-to-date overview of these is available via the EUR website.

Administrative responsibility for educational quality

The Executive Board (CvB - College van Bestuur) has integral final responsibility for the governance and management of the university. Deans act as – single-headed – governance and as administrators of the relevant faculty. Deans have their own legal governance powers regarding the content of education and scientific practice. This expresses the faculty's autonomy. In addition, they perform mandated management tasks under the responsibility of the Executive Board as laid down in the BBR.

At faculty level, therefore, substantive and policy choices are made, and resources are allocated to realize this substantive policy. The faculty has its own responsibility regarding the content and design of education. However, the Executive Board as competent authority is ultimately externally accountable for the quality of education. The Executive Board can therefore issue guidelines for the coordination and organization of education: substantive and policy choices at faculty level must fit within the frameworks of strategic policy. The dean accounts for this to the Executive Board.

Within EUR's governance model, vice-deans of education play an important role. Deans assign governance tasks to vice-deans of education as laid down in the Faculty Regulations. A number of vice-deans of education also have sub-mandated management tasks, laid down via Management Instructions. The dean has the legal mandate to provide for the governance of programmes within the faculty portfolio (WHW Art. 9.17). Within EUR, this takes the form of a programme director. This task assignment is also regulated in the Faculty Regulations.

One connected EUR

EUR has traditionally been strongly decentrally organized, with a high degree of autonomy for faculties and various mechanisms that promote interaction between the different layers within the organization. In its new strategy, EUR has set itself the goal of operating as one connected EUR and realizes this through strengthened leadership, collaboration and efficient structures. This means that in our organization we continue to cherish the room for faculty autonomy while even more emphasis is placed on collective action and mutual learning on joint policy themes. For education, our joint educational vision determines the course.

Within this governance model, working on educational quality is considered a joint responsibility of all actors in the educational process. The focus on implementing the educational vision through independent faculty policy shifts to elaboration of joint policy themes in institution-wide frameworks. This is developed in co-creation with representatives from faculties in thematic working groups and task forces. Important in this governance model is the connecting, collective leadership of deans and vice-deans of education, supported by an expert administrative line.

Good practice: Erasmian leadership profile

The Erasmian leadership profile offers a common frame of reference that can be applied in various processes at EUR, from recruitment and selection to evaluation and development. The profile elaborates four core principles (1. Be a role model; 2. Facilitate and involve others; 3. Inspire with vision and 4. Manage for results) in associated competencies at three levels of leadership: (1. Personal leadership; 2. Leading others and 3. Leading an organization). The profile was developed in collaboration with representatives from faculties and services and tested with researchers with expertise in leadership. All faculties and services use the profile.

3.2 Collective leadership and mastery

In addition to their responsibility in faculty governance, as described in the next chapter, vice-deans of education play an important role in preparing institution-wide decision-making regarding education. They are united in the interfaculty body of vice-deans of education, in which direction is given to education-related policy development based on an annual work agenda and portfolio distribution. The collective vice-deans of education advise the Executive Board on the spending agenda of the central Quality Funds. They also jointly lead the institution-wide part of the implementation agenda of the Community for Learning & Innovation (see 3.3) and oversee its implementation.

Topics on the agenda of the vice-deans of education are discussed in advance in the Education Workshop (Onderwijsatelier), a monthly consultation structure between the education and quality assurance policy advisors of Academic Affairs and the various faculties. The Education Workshop thus also functions as an administrative antechamber for the body of vice-deans of education. In addition, the Education Workshop fulfills a role in facilitating policy implementation in faculties and stimulating mutual learning by providing a platform for exchange of good practices and ensuring the outcomes of that exchange through a working group structure in facilitating guidelines, tools and formats.

3.3 Community approach and CLI

In addition to connecting leadership, an important role is reserved for institution-wide communities in which exchange and collaboration takes place across faculty boundaries on (often vision-driven) institution-wide themes. In the communities, those involved come together from diverse expertise, roles and responsibilities. These communities are in principle separate from formal governance; they operate across formal organizational structures and unite those involved around shared challenges or interests and from intrinsic motivation for developing and improving education. Characteristic is strong involvement of students and external stakeholders. In these contexts, collective meaning-making and professional identity formation through knowledge sharing via stories and practical examples is central. In this way, common themes are charged and made concrete from the bottom up, from the full breadth of the organization, and in dialogue with an outside perspective.

In the previous strategic period, this process of collective meaning-making and commitment to an institution-wide implementation agenda was driven by a number of central strategic programmes and projects on core themes and the Community for Learning & Innovation (CLI), a hub focused on supporting and developing innovation capacity. In the new strategic period, focus is brought to these various initiatives by having the majority of these programmes and projects land in the CLI. Within the CLI and strategic programmes, active collaboration takes place with strategic leadership, lecturers, educational management, policy advisors and learning innovators in faculties, ensuring connection between educational innovation and improvement activities in faculties and the institution-wide educational vision.

Good practice: CLI Fellowships

The Executive Board makes resources available for educational innovation in faculties, including through CLI Fellowships. A productive and sustainable balance between developing and improving requires more than just intrinsic motivation of those involved in education in a bottom-up approach. EUR makes work of anchoring the dual orientation on exploitation and exploration in the educational organization through targeted financial support of lecturers in developing, implementing and investigating the impact of innovations. Fellows can use the facilities and expertise within the CLI community and share their results here. Successful experiments can thus grow into structural additions to our education, with empirical substantiation of their added value.

The CLI and strategic programmes are led by academic leads, who fulfill a dual function as substantive leader and governance liaison, primarily to the vice-deans of education. The programmes work along the lines of established programme plans. The collective vice-deans of education coordinate (the majority of) the CLI's work agenda, based on periodic reassessment and prioritization of their collective substantive ambitions. To realize responsiveness and agility, part of the CLI's deployment is intended to support specific faculty innovations on a project basis and part for open innovation. Important outcomes and lessons learned are reported by the CLI to the vice-deans of education. The academic lead operating within the CLI on the theme of impact and engagement also serves as Strategic Dean of Impact & Engagement in an advisory role to the Executive Board and deans.

3.4 Collaboration with external partners

As a university with pronounced impact and engagement ambitions, EUR depends on relationships with external partners and stakeholders to realize its mission. These collaborations are shaped at all levels: at the level of course, programme, faculty and institution. The next chapter under 4.4 Societal and professional field advisory councils describes how external stakeholder involvement in quality assurance is implemented at different levels (and specifically reflection on the dimension of responsiveness), as happens for example within the institution-wide Societal Advisory Council. The following paragraph describes different types of collaboration with external partners and/or stakeholders in and for education. For each of these types of collaboration, it applies that clear agreements about mutual expectations and any mutual obligations must be properly recorded, but it is just as important that continuous attention is paid to developing a culture of collaboration and trust.

Strategic collaboration with other (higher) education institutions

Both at central and decentralized level, there is participation in local, regional and (inter-)national strategic partnerships and alliances with other (higher) education institutions to facilitate collaboration in education towards shared strategic (educational) goals. An example is the joint development and delivery of educational programmes in various forms. Both within the context of these strategic partnerships and alliances and in more incidental collaboration constructs, mobility of staff and students is facilitated.

Good practice: Convergence

Together with Erasmus MC, EUR is involved in the Convergence EUR-TU Delft-Erasmus MC established in 2019, where the ultimate goal is to create societal impact with the region as a living lab. In the framework agreement, signed in 2021, agreements about operations within Convergence are laid down which are coordinated from the Convergence Office. For Convergence, a separate governance structure has been established with a Convergence Executive Board and Convergence Supervisory Board, in which the chair of EUR's Supervisory Board has a seat.

Joint educational development with other higher education institutions in the accredited programme portfolio takes many forms. Collaboration can take place at the level of a CROHO-registered programme (CROHO is the Dutch Central Register of Higher Education Programmes), or at the level of a specialization or track within a programme. The faculty can also act as supplier for part of the education in a programme for which a degree is awarded by the other institution, or the contribution can be so substantial that a degree can (also) be connected to this on behalf of EUR. A collaboration can also lead to different types of degree conferral. We distinguish 'joint education' in the sense of WHW Art. 7.3c from so-called 'double degree programmes'.

Joint education versus double degree programmes

Double degree programmes refer to two programmes that are offered in parallel or consecutively and are partly aligned, but where there are essentially independent (and separately accredited) programmes to which separate degrees and diplomas are attached. EUR's responsibility for educational quality is then limited to the programme for which it awards a degree.

For programmes in the category of joint education in the sense of WHW Art. 7.3c (joint programmes), it concerns an integrated curriculum, where institutions jointly bear responsibility for quality. However, EUR's Executive Board remains accountable at all times for the entirety of the programme. This requires careful recording of mutual agreements regarding, among other things, governance, curriculum, educational organization, funding and tuition fees, accreditation and quality assurance.

WHW Art. 7.3c describes which matters must at least be recorded in a collaboration agreement. The EUR Guidelines for Joint Programmes describe various issues and points of attention in the design, organization and implementation of this type of educational collaboration.

Collaboration agreements should as a rule go through the FLAT ('Finance, Legal, Audit and Tax') check procedure, in which the proposed obligations are assessed on financial, legal, audit-technical and fiscal aspects. In 2023, an institution-wide framework was formulated for initiating, strengthening and evaluating international academic partnerships, as a result of the EUR Policy Framework 2021-2024. Responsibility for implementation lies with faculties. In 2024-2025, a committee has also been established that advises the Executive Board and deans, solicited and unsolicited, regarding handling (potentially) sensitive partnerships. This concerns collaboration with (academic and non-academic) partners that takes place in a context of conflict or debate.

Collaboration with societal partners, business and industry

Within EUR, there is also collaboration with societal partners, business and industry. Traditionally, these collaborations are primarily research-oriented, but with the transition to engaged, impact-driven education, this type of collaboration is also increasingly becoming part of the design of the teaching and learning environment. In addition to more institutional forms of collaboration at 'macro level', these connections are often also made at the level of a course, by an individual lecturer and/or student. This type of connection at 'micro level' can consist, for example, of a guest lecture, contributed case, or an internship and/or graduation assignment. Various forms of support are available from the strategic programme Impact at the Core (now embedded in the CLI) for lecturers and students regarding collaboration with external stakeholders.

Although the lecturer and examiner have an important role in organizing this type of collaboration and in supervising and assessing the student, with due regard for their professional autonomy, there are a number of aspects they must take into account. In addition to the outcomes of committees such as the aforementioned advisory committee on Sensitive Partnerships and the Committee of Experts on Fossil Industry, this concerns, for example, ensuring that students meet 'regular' requirements regarding scientific integrity,

ethics and/or GDPR compliance in data processing, which can come under extra pressure in the context of such collaborations with external parties. At faculty and/or programme level, (domain-specific) guidelines are developed for this, for example in the context of internship and thesis manuals. At institutional level, Erasmus Research Services (ERS) is preparing a framework for ethical review of research by students.

Development point: More structural collaboration within ecosystems

As an engaged university, EUR focuses on more structural and multilateral collaboration between academic and non-academic partners. Characteristic of this type of collaboration is the equality of partners within the knowledge and innovation ecosystem of which they are part. The regional ecosystem around EUR is strongly dominated by the port with all connected business activity and the presence of a super-diverse city in which major societal transition challenges are at play.

Organized around our impact domains and concrete challenges from the environment, we connect various partners with stakeholders, researchers and students in interdisciplinary learning networks. The ambition to embed student learning in these network contexts and have them collaborate with various parties raises questions, not only about the governance of such collaboration but also about adequate supervision and assessment of student learning in inherently open, complex learning situations.

4. Roles and responsibilities

4.1 Governance at different levels

The Executive Board leads the university. It determines general policy and is responsible for good governance and management of the institution. The Executive Board bears final responsibility for affairs within the institution, of which the quality of education and degree conferral is part. The Executive Board is the formal point of contact for external supervision by the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO - Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie) and Inspectorate and applicant for accreditations with NVAO. Deans head a faculty. They have their own legal powers regarding the content and design of education within their faculty. They arrange, among other things, the governance of education in the faculty and are responsible for educational quality within the faculty.

From university governance, it follows that both the Executive Board and deans bear governance responsibility for the quality of education.

Within EUR, there is shared ownership between Executive Board and deans over multi-year strategic planning on its core tasks – including education. The six-yearly design and implementation process of the strategy has an inclusive bottom-up approach, directed by a steering group with representation of deans. The Executive Board consults regularly with deans about the general state of affairs within EUR, including education and progress on realizing its strategic goals for education. Also, semi-annual bilateral governance consultation takes place between the Executive Board and the dean about matters concerning the relevant faculty.

Deans have assigned specific (governance) tasks on education in their faculty to the vice-dean of education. The governance of the programme is formed by the programme director, who is responsible for the quality of the relevant programme. Table 1 describes the core tasks regarding quality assurance of education for each of these roles. The (coordinating) lecturer role is also included in this overview. The professionalism with which lecturers implement educational policy and development and improvement cycles in their teaching is essential for the quality of education. In doing so, lecturers have an important formal responsibility regarding ensuring the student's learning process in their legal role as examiner.

Table 1: Overview of governance responsibilities regarding quality assurance of education

Level	Actor	Core tasks regarding quality assurance
Institution	Executive Board (CvB)	• Establishes institution-wide education and quality assurance policy • Allocates resources for implementation of education and development of educational quality within the institution • Monitors quality risks at main lines • Maintains structural and constructive dialogue with internal bodies at institutional level • Accounts to Supervisory Board and external stakeholders
Faculty	Dean	• Arranges governance of education in faculty • Establishes faculty education and quality assurance policy within institutional frameworks • Establishes Teaching and Examination Regulations of programmes within faculty

Level	Actor	Core tasks regarding quality assurance
		• Allocates resources for implementation of education and development of educational quality within faculty • Monitors quality risks within faculty portfolio • Maintains structural and constructive dialogue with internal bodies at faculty level • Accounts to Executive Board
	Vice-dean of Education	• Develops long-term vision for faculty education and advises dean accordingly • Develops faculty education and quality assurance policy within institutional frameworks • Prepares Teaching and Examination Regulations of programmes within faculty and monitors these • Promotes and ensures quality and efficiency of programmes within faculty • Manages and distributes resources for educational innovation within faculty • Directs quality assurance process within faculty • Facilitates and coordinates cross-programme coordination and collaboration • Maintains structural and constructive dialogue with internal bodies within faculty • Accounts to dean
Programme	Programme Director	• Prepares programme policy within institutional and faculty frameworks • Is responsible for (programme-specific part of) Teaching and Examination Regulations • Monitors coherence at curriculum level and substantively leads teaching team accordingly • Organizes evaluation system at course and curriculum level in line with faculty policy • Is responsible for implementation of interim programme evaluations and accreditations • Involves stakeholders at programme level in quality (assurance) processes • Maintains structural and constructive dialogue with internal bodies at programme level • Is responsible for periodic systematic reflection on and weighing of input from various feedback loops • Implements measures aimed at improvement and development of education within programme • Accounts to (vice-)dean
Course	(Coordinating) Lecturer	• Formulates (in coordination with programme director) course learning objectives, fitting intended learning outcomes • Provides education with appropriate teaching and assessment methods

Level	Actor	Core tasks regarding quality assurance
		• Reflects on own teaching practice and works on own professional development as lecturer • Provides input that can help strengthen programme quality, including via lecturer councils and education days • Follows up on outcomes of course evaluations and other signals at course level • As member of teaching team, contributes to follow-up of signals regarding curriculum coherence

First and second line responsibilities

In EUR's vision on quality assurance, there is a clear division of responsibilities between first and second line. Regarding programme quality, this looks as follows. The first line (programme director) is responsible for completing the full Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle (see Ch. 5), is result-responsible and risk owner. The second line (support staff) has two possible functions: support, respectively monitoring and advising. In the first function, the focus is on helping the first line execute their PDCA responsibilities by providing practical support, and in the second on monitoring the functioning of the PDCA cycle as embedded in the first line and (governance) advising on possible improvements. In practice, these two functions can be embedded in one and the same employee/advisor, although from the perspective of role-pure action it can have advantages to separate them across two functionaries.

The advisory functions exist at two levels: at central level, advice is primarily directed to the rector, at decentralized level to the (vice-)dean. When staff functions are more involved in actual process implementation, they often work directly with programme directors. This model places primary responsibility exactly where it belongs: with those directly involved in education, and ensures that all responsible parties receive the right support to fulfill these responsibilities. That the governance responsibilities of Executive Board and dean respectively are mirrored at the administrative level is important because the weighting given to interests and risks from the different positions may differ. It is precisely in the dialogue between those perspectives that the best outcome can be achieved.

The table below describes the core tasks regarding quality assurance of the advisory functions at central and decentralized level. A distinction is made between the role of education policy advisor and quality assurance in education advisor respectively. In addition to the described second-line roles, specific expert roles can be distinguished, such as that of educational scientist, assessment expert and/or learning innovator (where the latter is characterized by expertise regarding specific educational innovations). These are examples of roles primarily aimed at helping programme directors and lecturers in implementing and developing education.

Table 2: Overview of administrative responsibilities regarding quality assurance of education

Level	Actor	Core tasks regarding quality assurance
Institution	Academic Affairs / Education Policy Advisors	• Develops and maintains institution-wide education policy • Monitors implementation and execution of education policy • Collects and analyzes institution-wide quality data regarding policy themes

Level	Actor	Core tasks regarding quality assurance
		• Signals any quality risks regarding policy themes to Executive Board • Coordinates cross-faculty educational developments • Facilitates knowledge exchange regarding policy themes between faculties
	Academic Affairs / Quality Assurance in Education Advisors	• Develops and maintains institution-wide quality assurance policy for education • Monitors implementation and execution of quality assurance policy • Actively promotes quality culture within institution from ambassador role • Collects and analyzes institution-wide data regarding functioning of quality assurance • Signals any quality risks regarding programme quality to Executive Board • Develops institution-wide instruments and tools for quality assurance • Coordinates institution-wide evaluations and accreditations • Monitors implementation of programme evaluations and accreditations • Facilitates faculties in quality assurance via collegial advising and guidelines
Faculty	Faculty education policy advisor	• Develops and maintains faculty education policy • Monitors implementation and execution of education policy within faculty • Collects and analyzes faculty-wide quality data regarding policy themes • Signals any quality risks regarding policy themes to (vice-)dean • Coordinates educational developments within faculty • Facilitates knowledge exchange between programmes within faculty
	Faculty quality assurance advisor	• Develops and maintains faculty quality assurance policy for education • Monitors implementation and execution of quality assurance policy within faculty • Actively promotes quality culture within faculty from ambassador role • Collects and analyzes faculty-wide data regarding functioning of quality assurance • Signals any quality risks regarding programme quality to (vice-)dean • Develops (faculty-wide) instruments and tools for quality assurance • Coordinates interim programme evaluations and accreditations within faculty

Level	Actor	Core tasks regarding quality assurance
		• Supports and advises programmes in implementing quality assurance

Focus on ownership at programme level

Despite the traditionally decentralized orientation, there has always been strong Executive Board involvement in the preparation, implementation and follow-up of programme evaluations and accreditations within faculties. This heavily relies on an administrative advisory line embedded in constructive collaboration between central and faculty colleagues, including through faculty account management as embedded in the Academic Affairs department and the institution-wide Education Workshop (Ch. 6).

In the renewed policy, the role of the Executive Board and Academic Affairs shifts in favor of strengthening ownership at faculty and programme level. Executive Board involvement in programme accreditation remains important from its final responsibility for educational quality and as formal applicant for accreditations with NVAO. This means that during the process, the information dossier, panel report and action plan are successively placed on the agenda for adoption by the Executive Board, preceded by substantive discussion of the documents by Academic Affairs advisors with the rector.

Central to this revised policy is the lightening of the role and involvement of the Executive Board in the Interim Programme Evaluation (TOE - Tussentijdse Opleidingsevaluatie), the midterm instrument at programme level within EUR. TOE 2.0 assumes implementation of the process 'under own direction' of the faculty, and a light screening afterwards by Academic Affairs of the complete dossier in preparation for a development-oriented governance conversation between the rector and faculty. This means a shift in Academic Affairs' advisory role from 'quality guardian' at various process steps to quality assurance upfront through careful process design with guidelines and formats, and collegial advising and facilitation towards the faculty on request.

4.2 Representative bodies

Representative bodies play a crucial role in quality assurance and decision-making within EUR, as representative of students and staff and as critical conversation partner for administrators. Representative bodies have specific formal legal tasks and responsibilities regarding quality assurance of education. For example, the University Council and faculty councils have right of consent on the quality assurance system and on the elaboration of directional plans related to the institution's vision, at central and faculty level respectively. Faculty councils and programme committees have complementary advisory and consent rights on parts of the Teaching and Examination Regulations (OER). Programme committees annually assess the manner of implementation of the OER and provide solicited and unsolicited advice to the programme director and (vice-)dean on all matters concerning the programme's education. For all Representative bodies, it applies that they consist half of staff and half of students. This ensures a good balance between different perspectives.

Table 3: Overview of Representative bodies responsibilities regarding quality assurance of education

Level	Actor	Core tasks regarding quality assurance
Institution	University Council	• Advises Executive Board solicited and unsolicited on central policy and affairs within institution

Level	Actor	Core tasks regarding quality assurance
		• Signals what is happening and living across the organization and raises signals where necessary • Right of consent for certain matters, including Governance and Management Regulations (BBR), institutional plan, and central quality assurance policy
Faculty	Faculty Council	• Advises dean solicited and unsolicited on matters and developments within faculty • Signals what is happening and living that is relevant for faculty and raises signals where necessary • Right of consent for certain matters, including faculty regulations, faculty strategic plan, faculty quality assurance policy and part of OER (can give advice on parts where it has no consent right)
Programme	Programme Committee	• Advises programme director and (vice-)dean of education solicited and unsolicited on policy, organizational and substantive aspects of programme • Signals what is happening and living that is relevant for programme and raises signals where necessary • Monitors programme quality including by discussing reports of course and curriculum evaluations • Right of consent for certain matters, including part of OER (with advisory right on remaining parts): this includes at minimum consent right on the manner in which education in the programme is evaluated

Principles for involvement of representative bodies

The role of representative bodies at EUR goes beyond formal legal tasks. In line with our Erasmian values, we strive for representative bodies that are proactive and enterprising, independent but involved, well-informed and supported, and maintains a relationship with governance based on mutual trust. As an essential part of our quality assurance system, representative bodies are not props for compliance, but guardians of our quality culture.

Students and staff are actively involved in developing and implementing the educational vision and quality assurance vision, not only in formal decision-making. This applies at central and decentralized level. That early involvement in policy formation and informal dialogue alongside formal procedures has important advantages, but the focus on shared responsibility can also be at odds with representative bodies' critical, independent role.

To give shape to a careful balance between involvement and independence of representative bodies, governance at different levels observes the following principles:

- Timely and adequate information provision
- Adequate facilitation in time, training and support
- Responsiveness to advice and suggestions
- Transparency about representative bodies' influence on decision-making
- Appreciation and recognition of representative bodies' role

Good practice: Organization in Task Forces

Central representative bodies' role at EUR also takes shape in thematic and project-based involvement, where members delve into specific topics in task forces or working groups. This aligns with the party system within the University Council and offers room for more substantive expertise and continuity. The HOKA/BAO task force (regarding quality funds) is a good example: it functions as a substantive sounding board and think tank, contributing to strategic deployment of resources in close coordination with policymakers and stakeholders, without losing sight of the council's independence.

Compensation for representative bodies members

There are institution-wide governance agreements between Executive Board and deans about financial compensation and support for representative bodies members. Adequate compensation for representative bodies provides a stable basis for full collaboration between representative bodies and governance, and creates clarity about mutual expectations in a governance landscape where increasingly more is asked of representative bodies. It shows appreciation for the commitment shown by representative bodies members and recognition of the workload they bear by participating in a council or committee. Minimum compensation for representative bodies members ensures that participation in representative bodies is accessible to everyone. EUR-wide implementation of these guidelines also gives stature to the required commitment of representative bodies, whereby governance may also expect a certain dedication and input from their representative bodies.

Central facilitation and training

The central representative bodies coordinator positioned within the Academic Affairs department plays a key role in professionalizing and strengthening the positioning of representative bodies within EUR and strengthening collaboration and knowledge sharing between representative bodies. The representative bodies coordinator coordinates, among other things, institution-wide consultation structures and training. The EUR-wide training offer consists of basic and advanced modules for all layers of representative bodies, in which attention is paid to dialogue and collaboration with governance and other bodies from their own representative bodies role and responsibility. Administrative secretaries are trained to ensure continuity and transfer.

At institutional level, an evaluation is periodically conducted of the effectiveness of (decentralized) representative bodies. Outcomes of the biennial national representative bodies Monitor are placed on the agenda and discussed by the representative bodies coordinator in various consultations with representative bodies representation and subsequently with the rector. The rector personally engages in annual conversation with a representation of the different representative bodies layers by joining one or more meetings within the centrally coordinated consultation structure. Throughout the year, the coordinator advises the rector based on interim findings and broader reflections following current events. In this way, at Executive Board level, awareness is gained of what is happening within bodies and the picture of maturity level, development opportunities and support needs is regularly updated.

Good practice: decentralized project calendar 2025-2027

In 2025, faculties could submit proposals for funding multi-year initiatives around training, communication, visibility and support of representative bodies within the faculty. These projects are coordinated with representative bodies, clustered in a thematic development agenda, and jointly evaluated on impact and sustainability. This leaves room for decentralized ownership and customization, while at institutional level it is facilitated that insights and results are shared between faculties.

4.3 Examination boards

Examination boards play a crucial role in ensuring the quality of testing and assessment. Their tasks include, among other things, establishing guidelines and instructions within the framework of the Teaching and Examination Regulations to assess and determine test results, appointing examiners and providing them with guidelines for construction, assessment and administration of examinations, ensuring the quality of organization and procedures around testing, determining whether students meet the requirements for obtaining degrees, granting exemptions and handling fraud, acting on complaints about testing and advising on assessment policy.

Important principles for the functioning of examination boards:

- Proactive quality assurance: Not only acting reactively on complaints, but proactively monitoring (assessment) quality
- Assessment expertise: Having sufficient expertise in the field of testing and assessment
- Independence: Functioning as an independent body within the institution
- Professionalization: Continuously working on own expertise through training and exchange with other examination boards
- Collaboration: Collaborating with programme directors, lecturers and staff (assessment experts, policy and quality assurance advisors, learning innovators)
- Role purity: Care and assurance interlock and work together from separate responsibilities

The EUR Guidelines for examination boards elaborate extensively on the (legal) core tasks of examination boards, the division of responsibilities between 'care' and 'assurance' and the manner in which this is implemented within EUR.

Central facilitation

The institution-wide consultations of chairs of examination boards (OVE - Overleg Voorzitters Examencommissies) and secretaries of examination boards (OSE - Overleg Secretarissen Examencommissies) are structurally supported by a secretary positioned within the Academic Affairs department. Since the professionalization process of 2019–2020, these consultations have grown into a firmly anchored structure within EUR. They function as a platform for knowledge sharing, collegial consultation and exchange of good practices. The agenda is determined with the chair of the consultations, who is chosen from their own midst.

Collaborations that come about in these consultations, for example in the field of digital assessment or harmonization of procedures, contribute to further strengthening the role of examination boards within EUR's quality assurance. Through regular meetings, the lines between faculties and with central staff have become shorter and there is more efficient coordination on assessment policy, interpretation of regulations and quality assurance. An introduction training for new examination board members should ensure they can begin their task faster and better equipped. In addition, expertise meetings are regularly organized, where speakers are invited to provide depth on current themes such as assessment in the era of GenAI, fraud prevention or legal frameworks.

Through annual consultation between the rector and the OVE chair, with administrative and secretarial support by the OVE-OSE secretary positioned within Academic Affairs, awareness is gained at Executive Board level of current themes and issues at play within examination boards from the perspective of these bodies. Throughout the year, the OVE-OSE secretary discusses more informal findings and reflections on specific topics on the OVE-OSE agenda several times with the rector and Academic Affairs colleagues. This input is weighed and can, for example, lead to adjustments in guidelines, additions in support, involvement of specific experts for expertise meetings, or an assignment to Academic Affairs to recalibrate policy or develop additional policy.

Assessment committees

The examination board investigates, or has investigated, whether the quality of examinations and assessments is in order, as part of its legal core tasks. To fulfill this core task, examination boards can establish an assessment committee. Such an assessment committee investigates assessment quality on behalf of the examination board. An assessment committee established by the examination board is to be distinguished from any assessment committee (or individual assessment expert) established by the programme director to support in implementing their management responsibility to ensure assessment quality is in order. To clarify this distinction, the assessment committee acting on behalf of the examination board can best be referred to as an assessment assurance committee.

The output of an assessment assurance committee consists mainly of reports on the quality of examinations and assessments, possibly supplemented with advice to the programme director on how to maintain and strengthen quality. The examination board remains responsible, even though the assessment assurance committee does part of the actual work. In doing so, the examination board must ensure that the manner in which the assessment assurance committee does this meets the quality requirements established by the examination board. To this end, the examination board must itself have expertise in the field of assessment. Moreover, the examination board must be able to direct the assessment assurance committee if, in the examination board's judgment, the assessment assurance committee's working method does not meet quality requirements. During accreditation, the examination board will have to account for the 'assessment' aspect, even though an assessment assurance committee does the actual work. In its annual report, the examination board also reports on the work that the assessment assurance committee has performed on its behalf.

4.4 Societal and professional field advisory councils

At institutional level, a Societal Advisory Council (MRA - Maatschappelijke Raad van Advies) provides structural anchoring of an outside-in perspective in governance. The MRA consists of representatives from society and the professional field, who together represent the stakeholder environment relevant to EUR. It plays an important role in ensuring the responsiveness of EUR's vision and strategic course. The Executive Board is formally the MRA's client and can participate in meetings by open invitation. In addition, the Executive Board is informed about the MRA's activities by the Strategic Dean of Impact & Engagement, who participates in the council on behalf of EUR as vice-chair.

At decentralized level, societal and professional field advisory committees are active. Although form, composition, positioning and working method may differ between faculties and even between programmes within a faculty, the function they fulfill is of a similar nature to that of the MRA: the systematic organization of a feedback loop on responsiveness. Input obtained through these routes leads to (coordinated) adjustments in education at portfolio and/or curriculum level. See also Ch. 7 'Instruments'.

4.5 Internal supervision

Our internal supervision forms the ultimate form of organized counterbalance. According to WHW Art. 9.8, the Supervisory Board (RvT - Raad van Toezicht) supervises the governance and management of the university, and also provides solicited and unsolicited advice to the Executive Board. The Supervisory Board has at minimum the task of approving the institutional plan, budget, annual report, annual accounts and Governance and Management Regulations (BBR) of the university. The Supervisory Board also supervises the design of the quality assurance system. The Supervisory Board accounts to the Minister of Education, Culture and Science, who appoints the members of the Supervisory Board.

The Quality Committee functions as a specialized body within the Supervisory Board that specifically supervises developments in educational quality and quality assurance at EUR,

particularly with strategic developments such as recalibration of the educational vision and quality assurance vision, quality agreements/agreements in the context of the Higher Education Governance Agreement, and institutional quality assurance policy.

In accordance with the Supervisory Board's role as employer of the Executive Board, evaluation discussions are conducted by the Supervisory Board about collaboration with the Executive Board as a whole and about the role of individual Executive Board members. The Supervisory Board also reflects on its own functioning. In addition to the formal relationship with governance, the position of EUR's Supervisory Board is also characterized by a horizontal attitude aimed at good dialogue (see Ch. 6).

5. The quality assurance cycle

Every day, those involved in education at EUR undertake different types of activities that together help realize good education. These activities form part of what we call the 'Quality Circle' (Deming): Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA for short). The PDCA cycle ensures a systematic approach to quality improvement and creates a learning organization. This quality assurance principle describes a way of working that many education professionals apply in practice, even without specialist knowledge of quality assurance, but driven by professional curiosity and development orientation. The activities in the PDCA cycle are therefore an integral part of (educational) practice.

This cycle is applied at all levels of the organization. At course and programme level, lecturers, course coordinators and programme directors think about what they want to deliver and how they want to do it, within common frameworks (Plan); they make efforts for good implementation of those plans (Do), reflect with each other and together with stakeholders and peers on what is going well and what can be better (Check, sometimes also denoted by Study), and take steps to implement that improvement, whether that consists of adjustments in implementation or a recalibration of the goals themselves (Act). At faculty and institutional level, direction is given to the sum of those activities, coherence at portfolio level, and contribution to overarching organizational goals. At these levels too, there is periodic evaluation of whether the set goals in themselves are still appropriate.

5.1 Connecting internal and external quality assurance cycles

EUR's internal quality assurance does not stand alone but is connected to external quality assurance processes such as programme accreditation and the Institutional Quality Assurance Assessment (ITK). It is important to view and organize these processes coherently, so they reinforce each other and do not lead to unnecessary bureaucracy. Once every six years, an external assessment takes place in which peer panels examine whether the realization and evaluation of responsiveness, strategic alignment and effective educational design are adequate. All programmes (via programme accreditation) and the institution as a whole (via ITK) are assessed. The starting point for this external assessment is 'Ownership and (self-)confidence'.

The starting point for internal cycles is that these are organized in such a way that existing documentation for internal use together with outcomes and demonstrable follow-up of important feedback loops can be sufficient source for an external panel to arrive at an assessment. Conversely, it is possible to have feedback from peer panels flow back into the internal evaluation process. In this quality assurance policy, internal and external activities are therefore described as an integrated quality assurance system aimed at realizing our own goals and with the potential to provide full coverage for external assessment. In this way, we give concrete shape to ownership and self-confidence in quality assurance.

External six-yearly (accreditation) cycles

The six-yearly cycle for programme accreditation includes:

- Midterm evaluation at programme level (TOE 2.0)
- Preparation of self-evaluation / information dossier
- Visit by external peer panel
- Decision on programme accreditation by NVAO
- Development plan based on recommendations

The six-yearly cycle for the Institutional Quality Assurance Assessment includes:

- Midterm evaluation of quality assurance system
- Preparation of self-evaluation / information dossier
- Visit by external peer panel
- Decision on ITK by NVAO
- Development plan based on recommendations

To properly align internal and external cycles, EUR applies the following principles:

1. Development orientation: The internal quality assurance is primarily aimed at developing and improving education from own vision, not only at meeting accreditation criteria. By focusing on quality improvement, accreditation requirements are automatically met.

2. Continuous improvement: By organizing the quality assurance system for continuous improvement, peak load around accreditation moments is prevented as much as possible. The information dossier for the panel is then a natural summary of internal quality assurance results.

3. Evidence-based working: In developing programmes, we base ourselves on scientific insights and educational research. We also collect data on the quality of our education to substantiate choices in teaching methods and adjust where necessary.

4. Learning from external perspective: The external perspective of visitation panels is valued as a source of learning and development, not only as control or validation. Therefore, outcomes of conversations with panels are actively used for improvement.

5.2 Cycle of mission, vision and strategy

Plan-Do: At institutional level, the Executive Board and deans determine the common frameworks within which those involved at all levels implement the university's core tasks. These frameworks are primarily formed by Erasmian values, mission and institutional profile of EUR. The educational vision translates these into institution-wide principles for education. In the strategic plan, the concrete course is laid down by determining institution-wide long-term goals and outlining the steps to achieve them.

At institutional level, this can be elaborated in central strategic policy frameworks. Faculties develop strategic plans derived from the institutional plan and translate these into faculty strategic policy. In a joint effort, strategic goals are translated into concrete actions, fitting the context and course of each faculty. These goals and intended results are recorded in governance agreements between Executive Board and deans. Faculties then organize their education in line with the educational vision, strategic policy and made governance agreements.

Planning for Impact

EUR's mission is to make positive societal impact. But what exactly do we mean by impact? And what does this mean for our activities in the domains of research, education and engagement? The EUR-wide programme Evaluating Societal Impact (ESI) develops all kinds of tools to help those involved within EUR systematically plan and make visible efforts to create positive societal impact, from an institution-wide definition document to overviews of possible impact indicators and competencies, activities and outputs that we recognize and

value with a view to our impact ambitions. For a complete overview, consult ESI's Impact Toolbox: Tools and methods for a structured approach to your impact ambitions, activities and assessment (2025).

Check-Act → Are we doing the right things?

Mission and vision are periodically recalibrated based on broad dialogue with internal and external stakeholders. This reflection forms the starting point for redefining strategic priorities in a new institutional plan, ushering in the next strategic period. In this process of consultation and coordination, a group of peers is always also involved to anchor the critical external perspective in the reflection process. The midterm system at institutional level forms an effective instrument for this broad reflection. The external visit in the context of ITK also generates insights that can feed the further development of strategy.

Check-Act → Are we doing things right?

Based on governance agreements, targeted monitoring is organized, progress is made transparent and adjustments are made where necessary. At least twice a year during an Executive Board-Deans session (possibly supplemented with relevant service directors), progress on strategic goals and priorities is discussed based on agreements made in advance. In addition, semi-annual bilateral consultation takes place between Executive Board and faculties and services about progress for their organizational unit.

5.3 The policy cycle

In addition to the overarching cycle of mission, vision and strategy, each policy dossier also has its own PDCA cycle. To this end, the policy dossier holder formulates, in addition to the substantive policy plan, an implementation plan and monitoring and evaluation plan. This evaluation also focuses on the two previously mentioned core questions: Are we doing the right things, if necessary leading to recalibration of policy goals; and Are we doing things right, thereby keeping track of progress in realizing policy goals. If policy objectives are operationalized at programme level, reflection on the dimension of strategic alignment of the programme can in turn contribute to substantive policy evaluation.

Within EUR, policy cycles are organized at different levels of institution, faculty and programme. Between these cycles, interaction can exist, for example when institution-wide policy frameworks on a certain topic are further specified in faculty and/or programme policy, where outcomes of reflection at more operational level can in turn also lead to adjustment of strategic policy. This interaction ensures that strategic goals are translated into concrete educational practice, while signals from educational practice are communicated upward for policy adjustments. Each level functions as an indispensable link between strategic and operational aspects. The coherence between policy cycles at the level of institution, faculty and programme is visualized in figure X on the next page.

EUR facilities for educational research

Educational research is an important way to evaluate the effects of policy and interventions. Within EUR, various facilities are available that can support evidence-based policy evaluation. Through the Community for Learning & Innovation (CLI), EUR lecturers are given the opportunity to apply for a fellowship. With a CLI Fellowship, lecturers can spend 0.2 FTE weekly on conducting (small-scale) research into the implementation and/or effect of an educational innovation. The Fellow commits to the CLI for one or two years and actively contributes to the community, so knowledge exchange between Fellows and within EUR takes place. The CLI also supports various research and PhD projects with a focus on educational innovation. Results and scientific publications resulting from this are shared via the CLI website. Researchers at EUR can gain access to study data in the Erasmus Education Research (EER) Database. Expertise in educational research is also available within Risbo (a EUR research institute).

5.4 The planning & control cycle

Strategic ambitions and policy objectives are anchored in parallel annual planning & control cycles at different levels, aimed at strategic and financial management and control. These cycles are also interconnected: outcomes from the cycle at programme level feed reporting at faculty level, which in turn forms the basis for institution-wide reporting, while institution-wide priorities are translated to faculty and programme level.

Internal parallel annual (P&C) cycles

The annual cycle at institutional level includes:

- Establishing priorities (EUR annual plan)
- Monitoring via institution-wide dashboards and reports (including Data portal)
- Progress discussions with faculties (Bilateral Consultation)
- Annual accountability (EUR annual report)

The annual cycle at faculty level includes:

- Establishing faculty priorities
- Monitoring via faculty dashboards and reports
- Progress discussions with programmes
- Annual accountability

The annual cycle at programme level includes:

- Establishing programme priorities
- Implementing and analyzing structured feedback loops
- Discussing evaluation results with students and lecturers
- Annual accountability

5.5 Cycle of plans for improving educational quality

In the previous and current strategic period, resources have been made available by the government to higher education institutions for improving educational quality. Within EUR, we know the spending agenda for these resources over the period 2019-2024 under the name 'Higher Education Quality Agreements' (HOKA) and the spending agenda for the continuation of these resources from 2025 under the name 'Governance Agreement Education' (BAO - Bestuursakkoord Onderwijs). EUR's educational vision and strategy are leading in elaborating these plans.

In principle, plans and spending goals are formulated on a project basis, to which project control can be applied. From 2025, this project control is fully carried out at decentralized level under the dean's responsibility. Through faculty multi-year plans, faculties provide a main line overview of goals and spending and they account for resources in the annual report. At institutional level, this forms the basis for an accumulated picture in the EUR multi-year budget and EUR annual report.

In addition, substantive monitoring and evaluation takes place at institutional level via a reporting format that forms the basis for bilateral discussion in bilateral consultation, horizontal discussion by vice-deans of education and coordination with the University Council task force and Quality Committee of the Supervisory Board. Where possible, an explicit link is made to development goals operationalized at programme level. Programmes anchor these programme-specific goals in their own PDCA cycle at programme level.

From HOKA to BAO

HOKA (2019-2024):

- Faculty governance made claims to resources for strengthening educational quality via the route of Executive Board approval of decentralized project plans. Condition was that plans were prepared in co-creation with faculty representative bodies and were in line with one or more themes from EUR-wide quality and innovation agenda.
- The Community for Learning & Innovation (CLI) played an important role in connecting faculties in this process, by facilitating mutual learning and collaboration regarding educational innovation on core themes (including in communities and through exchange between faculty learning innovators), lecturer development and educational research.
- The central strategic programmes also funded with quality resources focused on implementing own programme plans and (demand-driven) initiating and supporting faculties in implementing innovations aligned with this, including through further specification of vision-bearing elements and deployment of central L&I officers with specific expertise.
- Monitoring and evaluation combined a project & programme control approach with focus on financial spending and realization of intended outputs with broad reflection, in the context of communities, on added value of joint efforts on the relevant theme.

BAO (2025 onwards):

- Decentralized ownership over elaboration of plans is strengthened by allocating resources for improving educational quality as part of the lump sum to faculties within the frameworks of the regular distribution model.
- Simultaneously, planning is streamlined through implementation of institution-wide policy frameworks based on educational vision, within which development activities of faculties and programmes must take shape.
- Faculties define their substantive goals for spending these resources, structured along a number of (predominantly vision-driven) themes, and periodically report their progress. This gives visibility at institutional level to where and how faculties are working on themes and where opportunities for collaboration and mutual learning exist.
- Vice-deans of education jointly determine the work agenda of the new CLI 2.0 based partly on this.
- In faculty reports, activities are also explicitly linked to one or more degree programmes, thereby laying a foundation for following the realization of development goals for educational quality at programme level.
- Programmes are asked to anchor programme-specific goals, and reflection on progress, in their own PDCA cycle at programme level, for example by including these in their programme development plan (or comparable system).

5.6 Cycle of educational quality at programme level

As explained in Chapter 2, we operationalize programme quality along three lines:

- Responsiveness is the programme's ability to adequately respond to needs, expectations and contexts of different stakeholders through adaptability and customization. Students, society and the professional field are the most important stakeholders.
- Strategic alignment is the extent to which a programme's mission, vision and goals are aligned with the institution's mission, vision and goals. Programme, faculty and institution work together in such a way that these goals - in the sum of activities - are realized.

- Effective educational design is based on the application of evidence-based educational theory, including the principle of 'constructive alignment'.

Activities aimed at developing and ensuring the coherence and quality of the programme along these three lines are embedded in the programme annual cycle. Organization in a cycle with duration of one year enables interaction with the annual Planning & Control cycle at faculty and institutional levels. In addition, it corresponds with the duration of an academic year. The annual cycle thus connects the various signals and recommendations gathered during the year with targeted, integral curriculum development that takes shape in the Teaching and Examination Regulations (OER) and syllabus or study guide. By annually weighing signals in mutual coherence and adjusting the OER based on this where relevant, broad stakeholder involvement in the process and transparency towards students and stakeholders regarding implemented adjustments are ensured. The OER thus functions as the formal foundation that supports and structures the PDCA cycle at programme level, aimed at student learning.

The annual (OER) cycle

Plan: The OER forms the formal translation of intended learning outcomes and curriculum into concrete agreements. It describes what students must learn, how that is assessed, and which procedures apply. The OER is thus the planning document in which the programme records its objectives, structure and quality requirements.

Do: During the current academic year, the OER serves as guideline for lecturers, students and support staff. The OER ensures everyone knows what is expected of them and how the programme functions in practice.

Check: In the evaluation phase, it is examined whether practice aligns with what is laid down in the OER. Are there relevant changes in the programme or programme offering? Are intended learning outcomes achieved? Do assessment methods function well? Are procedures workable? The OER serves here as reference framework to assess whether the programme performs as intended.

Act: Based on evaluations, the OER can be adjusted. These can be small adjustments in procedures or larger changes in final qualifications, curriculum or assessment. The OER is thus the instrument to formally record and implement improvements.

The OER must be seen in coherence with the examination board's Rules & Guidelines (R&R - Regels & Richtlijnen). The Rules & Guidelines specify the formal procedures around testing and examination that are globally described in the OER. This ensures a lawful and consistent assessment practice in accordance with OER agreements. For both documents, model versions have been prepared by EUR's Legal Affairs department, which help ensure that the elaboration per programme meets legal requirements. In practice, there are also various other (internal) documents that support the OER cycle (in the Plan phase). These are described in more detail in Ch. 7, with an explanation of core topics per document and the relationship to the OER.

We see that these documents, in mutual coherence, ensure a coherent programme design. They thus form the basis for ensuring the programme's constructive alignment: from vision to concrete intended learning outcomes, to curriculum that realizes these, to assessment that facilitates and measures learning. It can be noted that these different aspects of programme design could in themselves also be conceptualized as a PDCA cycle: the PDCA cycle of student learning. The NVAO framework for programme accreditation that applies to institutions with ITK recognition is based on such a conceptualization with its four standards:

- 1: Intended learning outcomes = Plan (what must the student learn?)
- 2: Teaching-learning environment = Do (how do we facilitate that learning?)
- 3: Assessment = Check (how do we measure whether learning is realized?)
- 4: Achieved learning outcomes = Act (what are the actual results and what does that mean for adjustment?)

Periodic recalibration of programme profile and intended learning outcomes

The programme profile and intended learning outcomes, as starting point for the PDCA cycle of student learning, must be aligned with important developments and stakeholder needs and have support within the programme. To this end, these are periodically recalibrated based on signals and systematically collected input and at minimum discussed with lecturers and in the programme committee. For this, the programme deploys various reflective instruments, answering the question Are we doing the right things? Examples are benchmarks, student panels, alumni and professional field research and advice from professional field committees and advisory councils. Where relevant, necessary adjustments are then made in the OER and (other) planning documents. Assessment plans are periodically evaluated by the examination board.

Integration of small feedback loops

In parallel, evaluation is also organized around the question Are we doing things right? Various instruments can also be deployed for this. While the evaluation question Are we doing the right things usually does not lead to adjustments within the academic year (and in some cases it may even be desirable to make changes only on a cohort basis), the evaluation question Are we doing things right can be organized in shorter cycles. Some of these 'small feedback loops' have a paper trail. Consider questionnaire-based student evaluations whose outcome analysis is discussed in a programme committee meeting, after which improvement actions are included in an action plan. Or examination board recommendations to the programme director mentioned in their annual report. Others are more informal and ad hoc in nature. Consider adjustments that are immediately picked up after an exchange between lecturers at the coffee machine or after student feedback received in class. At least annually, the programme director reports transparently to the dean and other stakeholders about follow-up of all relevant signals from various feedback loops.

Integral development plans

Often, following up on a signal requires a combination of actions, with involvement of multiple action holders, where mutual dependencies may exist and possibly significant time and resources are involved. For systematic, manageable and transparent follow-up, an action plan is used. Panel recommendations often have such scope, but this can also apply to signals from other stakeholders. The programme director maintains oversight of all different (possibly multi-year) development lines via own tooling, for example via the Programme Development Plan (see Ch. 7). At least annually, these are prioritized and specified for the upcoming year and embedded in the planning & control cycle.

Closing feedback loops at programme level

By looking at educational quality with multi-stakeholder involvement, from different perspectives, and analyzing these perspectives in coherence, a solidly substantiated picture of educational quality emerges. Programme directors ensure that at least annually, input is systematically gathered and weighed from all relevant stakeholders. The programme director regularly discusses the outcomes of deployed evaluation instruments and the status of the programme's development agenda with the programme committee and where relevant faculty council and examination board. Students are informed of improvements that have been implemented. Feedback is provided to all stakeholders who have shared their findings, recommendations and priorities with the programme director about follow-up. Annually, the programme director also discusses the main developments, priorities, results, risks and measures with the (vice-)dean.

Stacking cycles upward

Development and assurance of educational quality at programme level takes shape under the dean's responsibility. In the six-yearly accreditation cycle, it is externally validated whether internal quality assurance realizes educational quality at programme level. Via the

Interim Programme Evaluation (TOE) halfway through the accreditation cycle, internal quality assurance is given an extra impetus. This six-yearly (accreditation) cycle is the only educational quality cycle at programme level with direct Executive Board involvement.

Through the instruments of accreditation and TOE, information from the programme annual cycle is 'brought upward' every three years. Conversely, outcomes of accreditation and TOE feed agenda setting and prioritization of development themes within the programme annual cycle. In the combination of programme accreditation (with focus on effective educational design and realized quality) and TOE 2.0 (with focus on responsiveness, after integral reflection on all dimensions in the quickscan), leadership at all levels of the organization can have access to the information needed for continuous reflection on the quality of EUR's programme portfolio across the full breadth of our quality concept.

6. Dialogue structures in coherence

At institutional level, decision-making takes place in the (approximately weekly) Executive Board meeting. As portfolio holder for education within the Executive Board, the Rector Magnificus is the primary conversation partner for education dossiers. At faculty level, the dean is governance-responsible for educational quality within the faculty. Within EUR, the 'good conversation' about educational quality is conducted in different conversation compositions and at different levels. These conversation structures are on one hand feeding decision-making and on the other hand play a role in implementing and having decisions work through across the organization.

We distinguish vertical and horizontal conversation structures:

- **Vertical structures** are based on hierarchical relationships between (governance) levels. These primarily focus on strategic management, allocation of resources and accountability - such as Bilateral Consultation ('Bilo') between Executive Board and faculty governance that takes place twice a year. The dialogue between Executive Board and Supervisory Board also falls under this.
- **Horizontal structures** focus on professional dialogue between colleagues aimed at coordination, mutual learning and shared ownership over development and assurance of educational quality.
 - **Horizontal-collegial structures** bring together colleagues in the same role. Examples are lecturers within a programme, programme directors within a faculty, but also (vice-)deans of all faculties united in an institution-wide body. These are often the places where decision-making is prepared that transcends the direct scope of own responsibility but does have impact on own professional room for maneuver. Central is realizing coherence between own activities and the bigger picture; in short: filling in shared ownership.
 - **Horizontal-functional structures** facilitate conversation between colleagues operating from different roles, each contributing from own role and responsibility to development and assurance of educational quality. An example is dialogue between governance and representative bodies, or between programme management and examination board. These are often places where plans and proposed decisions are tested against different perspectives (checks & balances). Central is realizing supported choices through careful weighing of interests.
 - In addition to these governance-based dialogue structures, there are a number of places in the organization where conversation takes place separate from formal governance, such as in Communities of Practice. These **horizontal-learning structures** play a key role in quality culture and are therefore also actively stimulated and facilitated by governance. This is less about decision-making and more about own professional development, development of shared vision, language and professional identity, peer consultation, sharing good practices and joint reflection on cases in the context of mutual learning.

6.1 Vertical dialogue structures (Institution & Internal supervision)

Supervisory Board (RvT) consultation structure

In addition to formal Supervisory Board meetings with the Executive Board quarterly and parallel preparatory committee meetings of the Audit Committee (AC) and Quality Committee (KC) with the rector, the Supervisory Board discusses various (societal) developments in strategy sessions with Executive Board and deans that are relevant for

EUR's strategic positioning in the medium and long term. There is also regular consultation between Executive Board and Supervisory Board of EUR and the Executive Board and Supervisory Board of Erasmus MC. EUR's Supervisory Board makes physical visits to faculties according to schedule. Throughout the year, informal consultations also take place several times between Supervisory Board members among themselves and/or with Executive Board members and deans. Twice a year, there is also conversation between Supervisory Board and the University Council presidium.

Consultation	Frequency	Conversation partners	Support & preparation	Topics
Institution ↔ Internal Supervision				
RvT-Executive Board meeting cycle	4x per year	RvT members & Executive Board	Governance Affairs (BZ; secretarial), dossier holders from Academic Affairs (AZ) and/or other departments (substantive)	• General governance and management of university, including institutional plan, budget, annual report, annual accounts and Governance and Management Regulations (BBR), including education priorities • Specifically also the design of EUR's quality assurance system
KC-Executive Board meeting cycle	4x per year	RvT-KC members & Rector	BZ (secretarial), dossier holders from AZ and/or other departments (substantive)	• Developments in educational quality and quality assurance at EUR, including accreditation outcomes
RvT-UR meeting cycle	2x per year	RvT members & UR presidium	BZ (secretarial)	• Representative bodies perspective on university governance and management and collaboration

				with Executive Board
--	--	--	--	----------------------

6.2 Vertical dialogue structures (Institution & Faculty)

Below, the vertical dialogue structures between institutional level and faculty level are described.

Bilateral Consultation (Bilo)

Twice a year, in spring and fall, formal bilateral consultation takes place between the Executive Board and the dean of each faculty, supported from the General Administrative Service. The bilo's purpose is to facilitate dialogue between these parties with the annotated agenda. Among other things, finance & risk, strategy and human resources are discussed. The faculty has the opportunity to submit topics for the bilo themselves. The steering group at institutional level, consisting of the director Corporate Planning & Control (CPC), head of Control & Risk, director Human Resources, director Academic Affairs and director Strategy Office (SO), ensures integral preparation of and advising on bilo agendas for the Executive Board, with support from substantive experts from involved departments. Bilo is a decision-making conversation. Any decision-making can lead to adjustments in faculty objectives.

- Preparation of the spring bilo round for faculties takes place under direction of the Academic Affairs (AZ) department.
 - The agenda then primarily focuses on substantive discussion of (progress on) strategic plans and objectives.
 - Sources for these conversations include faculty annual reports, data on key indicators in the institution-wide bilo portal and strategy monitor, and reports and reflections from policy dossier holders and strategic programmes positioned within AZ.
 - This central source information can be supplemented with specific management information and thematic reflections made available from the faculty context.
- Preparation of the fall bilo round takes place under direction of Corporate Planning & Control.
 - The agenda then primarily focuses on finance & risk, based on the outcomes of budget discussions in September.
 - Sources for these conversations include faculty multi-year plans and periodic reports on realized results.
 - Focus is on the connection between substantive goals, risks and finances. Therefore, input is included from substantive experts from other services (AZ, HR, SO) on specific themes.

Regular rector & dean consultation

In addition, the rector magnificus periodically (approximately monthly) consults with the dean of each faculty about the state of affairs in the faculty regarding education (and research).

- Attention points can be placed on the agenda that follow from the going concern quality assurance portfolio, for example based on outcomes of programme evaluation or accreditation processes or periodic reflection on the functioning of decentralized quality assurance in the faculty.
- Such attention points are discussed in advance in regular account discussions between the faculty account holder from AZ and the faculty quality assurance advisor

and subsequently in the weekly consultation of the Academic Affairs team with the rector.

Consultation	Frequency	Conversation partners	Support & preparation	Topics
Institution level ↔ Faculty level				
Bilo meeting cycle	2x per year	Executive Board & dean	AZ & CPC in coordination with faculty colleagues	• Development and realization of strategic course of institution and faculty • Associated allocation of resources • Strategic risk management
Regular consultation	Approx. monthly	Rector & dean	AZ in coordination with faculty colleagues	• State of affairs in faculty regarding education • Attention points from going concern quality assurance

6.3 Vertical dialogue structures (Faculty & Programme)

Below, the vertical dialogue structures between faculty level and programme level are described.

Programme annual discussions

At minimum annually, formal coordination takes place between faculty and programme level. The dean can speak with the programme director, or the vice-dean of education can conduct these conversations and report on them to the dean. Through this consultation structure, the dean at minimum maintains oversight of (realization of) goals, (follow-up of) signals and (recalibration of) priorities of programmes. Attention also goes to risk management through structured discussion of (operational) educational risks and mitigating measures.

The consultation can be prepared and supported by the faculty quality assurance advisor. In the interim, the vice-dean of education keeps track of the state of affairs within each programme and reports on this to the dean.

Regular vice-dean of education & programme director(s) consultation

In addition, the vice-dean of education periodically (approximately monthly) consults with all programme directors, organized per programme and/or at portfolio level.

- In these regular consultations with programme directors, development and implementation of faculty education and quality assurance policy, strategic portfolio management and faculty-wide coordination of quality assurance and innovation activities are on the agenda.

- This consultation is usually prepared and facilitated by the faculty quality assurance advisor, where relevant in collaboration with the faculty education policy advisor and any learning innovator.
- The agenda can also be discussed in advance and prepared in consultations involving, for example, programme coordinators, study advisors and/or managers of education and student affairs.

Consultation	Frequency	Conversation partners	Support & preparation	Topics
Faculty level ↔ Programme level				
Programme annual discussion	Annually	(Vice-)dean & programme management	Faculty quality assurance advisor (in coordination with colleagues)	• Goals and results, systematic follow-up of signals in coherent development plan • (Operational) risk management
Regular consultation	Approx. monthly	Vice-dean & programme director(s)	Faculty quality assurance advisor (in coordination with colleagues)	• Development and implementation of faculty education and quality assurance policy • Strategic portfolio management • Coordination of quality assurance and innovation activities

6.4 Horizontal-collegial dialogue structures

Below, the main horizontal-collegial dialogue structures at institutional level are described. In a comparable manner, faculties and programmes give shape to horizontal-collegial dialogue structures within which conversation between programme directors in the faculty and between lecturers in a programme is conducted. These working methods are described in the faculty quality assurance policy.

Executive Board-Deans consultation

Executive Board and deans of all faculties meet approximately monthly, chaired by the rector. The consultation is secretarially supported by a governance secretary from Governance Affairs. The consultation has no formal decision-making powers but functions as advisory body to the Executive Board. Deans consult here with the Executive Board about general governance and strategic matters, from the shared responsibility of deans to monitor and safeguard the university's academic quality, integrity and reputation. The

consultation thus forms an important link between university policy and faculty implementation.

Vice-deans of Education consultation

Vice-deans of education of all faculties meet approximately monthly, in the presence of the rector. The consultation is secretarially supported by a governance secretary from Governance Affairs, with substantive support to portfolio holders from Academic Affairs. Agenda setting is coordinated with the consultation chair, who is designated from among the vice-deans on a rotating basis. Based on an annual work agenda and portfolio distribution, the collective vice-deans lead policy development in the education domain.

Education Workshop

Topics on the vice-deans of education agenda are discussed in advance in the Education Workshop, a monthly consultation structure between education and quality assurance policy advisors from Academic Affairs and the various faculties. The Education Workshop thus also functions as an administrative antechamber for the vice-deans of education body. In addition, the Education Workshop fulfills a role in facilitating policy implementation in faculties and stimulating mutual learning by providing a platform for exchange of good practices and ensuring the outcomes of that exchange through a working group structure in facilitating guidelines, tools and formats.

Consultation	Frequency	Conversation partners	Support & preparation	Topics
Institution level				
Executive Board-Deans consultation	Approx. monthly	Executive Board & deans of all faculties	BZ (secretarial)	• General governance and strategic matters
Vice-deans of Education consultation	Approx. monthly	Vice-deans of education of all faculties (in presence of rector)	BZ (secretarial), AZ (substantive)	• Institution-wide strategic and going concern policy development in education domain
Education Workshop	Approx. monthly	Central & faculty education and quality assurance policy advisors	AZ & rotating faculty chair	• Administrative expert input for institution-wide policy development in education domain • Interfaculty exchange about and institution-wide support for policy implementation in education domain

6.5 Horizontal-functional dialogue structures

Below, the main horizontal-functional dialogue structures at institutional level are described. In a comparable manner, faculties and programmes give shape to horizontal-functional dialogue structures between governance on one hand and representative bodies, examination boards and professional field respectively on the other. In addition, these groups are sometimes also periodically brought together at programme level, for example in an annual kick-off, for joint, multi-stakeholder reflection ('360° feedback') on (realization of) quality goals. These working methods are described in faculty quality assurance policy.

Executive Board-University Council

The Executive Board meets monthly with the University Council (UR) about university policy in the areas of education, research, finance, personnel & organization based on a jointly prepared agenda. In this consultation, legally required topics are addressed, but also topics about which the Executive Board and University Council want to engage in mutual dialogue, and where the University Council can give (un)solicited advice.

Executive Board-Examination boards

Through annual consultation between the rector and the chair of the interfaculty Consultation of Chairs of Examination Boards (OVE), with administrative preparation and secretarial support by the OVE-OSE secretary positioned within Academic Affairs, awareness is gained at Executive Board level of current themes and issues at play within examination boards from the perspective of these bodies.

Executive Board & deans-MRA

EUR's Societal Advisory Council (MRA - *Maatschappelijke Raad van Advies*, a Dutch stakeholder advisory body) meets two to three times per calendar year, with secretarial support from Governance Affairs (BZ). Its primary task is to advise Executive Board and deans on societal and strategic themes regarding the core tasks of education, research and engagement. The chair is held by a participating member of the MRA. On behalf of EUR, the Strategic Dean of Impact & Engagement participates in the council as vice-chair. The Executive Board participates by open invitation in meetings, and is additionally informed by the Strategic Dean I&E about MRA activities. Feedback also takes place towards deans and Supervisory Board. Deans can also be invited to MRA meetings based on agenda items.

Consultation	Frequency	Conversation partners	Support & preparation	Topics
Institution level				
Executive Board-UR meeting cycle	Monthly	Executive Board & UR	BZ (secretarial), dossier holders from AZ and/or other departments (substantive)	• Institutional policy in areas of education, research, finance, personnel & organization
Rector-OVE chair conversation	Annually	Rector & OVE chair	AZ (OVE-OSE secretary) in coordination with AZ colleagues	• Current themes and issues from examination boards' perspective
MRA meetings	2-3x per year	MRA members, including Strategic	BZ (secretarial)	• Advice on societal and

		Dean of I&E on behalf of EUR Optional/by invitation: Executive Board members & deans		strategic themes, such as: • Societal trends and developments • Governance or substantive issues submitted by deans or Strategic Dean I&E • Design and implementation of impact ambitions • Further development and strengthening of third core task engagement
--	--	---	--	--

6.6 Horizontal-learning dialogue structures

Below, the main horizontal-learning dialogue structures at institutional level are described. In a comparable manner, faculties and programmes give shape to horizontal-learning dialogue structures, for example in the form of education days. These working methods are described in faculty quality assurance policy.

Communities

In various institution-wide communities, exchange and collaboration takes place across faculty boundaries, by those involved from diverse expertise, roles and responsibilities, on (often vision-driven) institution-wide themes. Each community is led by an academic lead, a senior staff member with experience in the community's topic, and is facilitated from the Community for Learning & Innovation (CLI). In these contexts, collective meaning-making and professional identity formation through knowledge sharing via stories and practical examples is central. In communities of practice, exchange of ideas goes hand in hand with developing practical proposals. The academic lead works closely with a vice-dean of education or programme director to make connections between informal and formal leadership within the organization.

Broad representative bodies dialogues

Quarterly, on the University Council's initiative, consultation takes place between central and decentralized representative bodies. This concerns both faculty councils and programme committees (with student and staff representation) and the Erasmus Labour Council (ELC, the local consultation of trade unions) and service councils. The representative bodies coordinator positioned within Academic Affairs also coordinates various institution-wide consultation structures in which representative bodies at different levels comes together.

OVE-OSE

The institution-wide, centrally facilitated monthly consultations of examination board chairs (OVE - *Overleg Voorzitters Examencommissies*) and examination board secretaries (OSE - *Overleg Secretarissen Examencommissies*) provide not only guidance and coordination but also function as platform for knowledge sharing, collegial consultation and exchange of good practices.

CLI network structures

In addition to multi-actor communities of practice and learning communities, informal dialogue about educational development is embedded from the CLI in two other types of 'communities'. In the community of learning innovators and other professional supporters from various faculties and services, exchange takes place about possibilities to address and tackle challenges in education. Finally, there is the Students-for-Students (S4S) Community, which facilitates student projects that contribute to improving education for students within and alongside the official curriculum. The CLI also organizes various network meetings.

Institution-wide thematic dialogues & town hall meetings

On various strategic themes, institution-wide dialogue series are organized, on the initiative of the Executive Board and sometimes also on the initiative of students and staff, but facilitated by the Executive Board. In addition, the Executive Board organizes Town hall meetings for staff several times a year to engage in conversation about current developments and questions from the EUR community. Exchange of ideas about topics that are alive within the organization is central. During meetings, the Executive Board gives an update on the latest state of affairs and there is opportunity to ask questions.

7. Instruments

Within EUR, we work on quality of education via two types of instruments that together form a cycle:

- **Proactive instruments** are forward-looking tools (Plan) with which we as institution convert our vision on educational quality (educational vision) into concrete action. This concerns establishing policy and formulating (measurable or noticeable) objectives - for example frameworks regarding design of the learning environment for impact-driven education, preconditions for an inclusive learning environment, and lecturer development. These instruments give direction and set the course.
- **Reflective instruments** are tools (Check, or: Learn) with which we reflect whether set goals are still aligned with stakeholder needs and expectations and to what extent these have been realized. This happens by systematically collecting feedback from different stakeholders. At programme level, these are for example students and lecturers, representative bodies and examination board, alumni, society and professional field.

The cyclical character arises because outcomes of reflective instruments automatically lead to new proactive measures: when goals are not achieved or require recalibration, plans are made that again deliver new target goals and policy. This approach can be applied at all organizational levels, from course to institution, where instruments must always align with overarching policy frameworks. This creates systematic, continuous improvement of educational quality.

7.1 Decentralized instruments

The decentralized instruments form the basis for continuous quality assurance. Programmes use various proactive (policy) instruments within their quality assurance cycle, with which they operationalize institutional and faculty frameworks at programme level. Consider the programme vision, didactic-pedagogical concept of the programme, and the OER in which these receive concrete elaboration in a coherent examination programme. Periodically, implementation of goals, as well as the goals themselves, are evaluated by the programme director, based on continuous feedback loops with involvement of important stakeholder groups. These instruments ensure continuous input from diverse perspectives.

The choice, frequency and design of these instruments is primarily the programme's responsibility, within the framework of institutional and faculty policy. Leading in the choice for deployment of specific instruments are EUR's vision on quality assurance, where an appreciative and development-oriented approach with room for autonomy is paramount, and EUR's vision on educational quality, which centers a societal-transformative perspective. The dean systematically monitors the suitability and effectiveness of these instruments within the faculty. Exchange and mutual learning about this is facilitated centrally. The Executive Board monitors at main lines the functioning of quality assurance at programme level via the Interim Programme Evaluation (TOE).

Good practice: Evaluating impact-driven education

How do we evaluate impact of our activities in the domain of education, research and engagement activities? The institution-wide programme Evaluating Societal Impact (ESI) offers guidance with an overview of different methods for impact evaluation. Specifically for education, ESI has developed a handbook in collaboration with Impact at the Core (now embedded in the CLI) for evaluating the effect that a specific curriculum component has on the development of students' impact capacity. A digital item bank with example questions is part of this.

Proactive instruments at programme level

The following instruments can support the OER cycle as described in Ch. 5.6:

Instrument	Explanation	Relationship to OER
Programme vision and profile	• The vision document describes the programme's fundamental principles and ambitions. It answers the question: Why do we exist as a programme? What do we educate students for? • The programme positions itself relative to related offerings by explicitly naming profiling characteristics, and relates to institutional and faculty educational vision. Where relevant, concrete connection is made to EUR research groups/impact domains.	• The vision document forms the foundation on which the OER is based - vision determines direction, OER makes this operational. Vision inspires and motivates, while OER regulates and structures.
Intended learning outcomes	• Programme vision and profile are elaborated in a set of coherent learning objectives, the intended learning outcomes. Intended learning outcomes answer the question: What must students know, understand, be able to do and be after completing the curriculum? • These are the formal final qualifications that students must have demonstrably realized at the end of their programme to receive their diploma, and which determine the assessment strategy. • In formulating intended learning outcomes, reference is made to the Dutch qualifications framework (NLQF), any requirements from the professional field and if applicable the domain-specific reference framework.	• Intended learning outcomes form the concrete measurable level, while OER describes how these are realized and assessed.
Didactic-pedagogical concept	• The didactic-pedagogical concept describes the programme's educational philosophy and approach. It gives direction to how education is shaped, which is	• The didactic-pedagogical concept inspires practice, OER formalizes implementation.

	then laid down in the OER in concrete teaching methods and approaches. • The programme relates to institutional and faculty educational vision and strategic education policy.	
Curriculum matrix	• The curriculum matrix shows how intended learning outcomes are realized through different courses and activities. It helps make coverage transparent.	• The matrix is an important instrument to check whether the OER is complete and coherent - all intended learning outcomes must be covered.
Assessment plan and assessment matrix	• The assessment plan systematically describes what is assessed at which moments and in which manner. An assessment matrix shows the coherence and coverage of assessment in relation to intended learning outcomes. • The programme relates to institution-wide assessment vision and assessment framework and faculty assessment policy.	• Both documents support and specify what is described in the OER about assessment. The assessment plan makes organization operational, the assessment matrix ensures substantive completeness and coherence of assessment as intended in the OER.

Reflective instruments at programme level

The programme director deploys a combination of instruments to support different feedback loops, such as:

Category	Explanation	Possible forms
Student evaluations	• Provide insight into students' experience and satisfaction with education received.	• Can take the form of surveys (such as the national National Student Survey and internal questionnaire-based course and curriculum evaluations), but also a conversation form (such as focus groups and student panels).
Lecturer consultations	• Provide insight into educational quality and curriculum coherence from professional perspective.	• Can take the form of curriculum committees, but also various lecturer consultations with

		an evaluation agenda in which signals about overlap, gaps and connection between courses are discussed.
Alumni research	• Provide insight into (alumni satisfaction with) the programme's alignment with the labour market and alumni functioning in professional practice.	• Can take the form of surveys (such as the national National Alumni Survey and internal questionnaire-based alumni research), but also a conversation form (such as alumni panels).
Professional field and stakeholder consultations	• Provide insight into societal relevance of education and alignment with current developments in the field and professional practice.	• Can take the form of advisory councils with representatives from the professional field, but also for example consultations with employers and other external stakeholders.
Learning outcomes and assessment analyses	• Provide insight into assessment quality and realized level.	• Can take the form of quantitative analyses (such as statistical analyses of assessment results) and qualitative analyses (such as peer review of assessments and final projects).
Benchmarks and benchlearning	• Offer external reference points to assess education quality, compare with other institutions, and learn from each other.	• Can take the form of more quantitative comparison of for example NSE and NAE data, but also more qualitative comparative analyses, such as peer reviews in the context of accreditation and exchange of good practices with other institutions around

		a certain theme or issue.
--	--	---------------------------

Periodic programme reporting

The programme director reports at minimum annually transparently to the (vice-)dean about the programme's objectives and ambitions, specific priorities for the coming year, realization of set goals, and handling of outcomes from various feedback loops. Instruments that can support systematic reporting are the programme annual plan and programme annual report or the combined instrument of the Programme Development Plan that looks both forward and backward. In parallel, examination board and programme committee follow their own (annual) quality cycle.

Good practice: Programme Development Plan

A number of faculties work with a form of Programme Development Plan (OOP - *Opleidingsontwikkelplan*). The Programme Development Plan is a facilitating management tool in which the programme director, in coordination with stakeholders at programme level:

- Periodically records the programme's current quality goals, structured along the standards of the programme accreditation framework;
- Determines programme priorities for the coming year;
- Collects and clusters feedback from the most important stakeholder groups, including at minimum: Students, Lecturers, Representative bodies, Examination Board, Societal/professional field representation, Alumni, and Peers/visitation panels;
- Formulates SMART-formulated development actions in response to signals and recommendations;
- Monitors and evaluates progress on these development actions.

Depending on the precise implementation of the tooling, the OOP can integrate the functions of programme annual plan and programme annual report in its design. The OOP thus offers an integrated overview of all improvement points, recommendations and development goals from different sources and stakeholders. It facilitates programme directors in bringing clear prioritization and prevents fragmentation of quality initiatives.

Through the systematic approach, transparency arises about choices made and stakeholders can see how their contributions are weighed in the programme's total development agenda. This contributes to more coherent and focused quality development. Because the OOP follows the structure of the programme accreditation framework, information directly aligns with accreditation requirements.

The following steps can support effective implementation:

- Annual input round: The OOP is annually submitted to all relevant stakeholders, so they can systematically provide their findings, recommendations and priorities.
- Quarterly monitoring: The plan is placed on the agenda by the faculty quality assurance advisor quarterly in consultations with the programme director. This ensures continuous monitoring of progress and possibility for adjustment when new developments or insights require this.
- Weighing and prioritization: Programme directors can use the harmonized overview to weigh different recommendations against each other, taking into account available resources, urgency and strategic interests of the programme.

Examination Board annual report

Examination boards have the legal mandate to produce their own annual report. In the annual report, the examination board accounts for its activities. The examination board

formally presents the annual report to the dean. The annual report is an occasion to conduct conversation within the Examination Board about developments around assessment quality. That conversation can subsequently also be conducted with the dean and programme director following the annual report. Of course, the programme director and examination board speak to each other regularly and there will be no major surprises in the annual report.

However, a good annual report offers the possibility to take some distance from daily affairs and reflect more on tendencies and desired developments. The EUR Guidelines for examination boards: Reporting and facilitation outlines requirements for a good annual report. It states, among other things, that the examination board does not limit itself to describing its activities but also values these and draws conclusions about desired developments. To value existing assurance tasks, the examination board can use a checklist.

Signals or recommendations from an examination board's annual report are involved in a traceable manner in the internal PDCA at programme level. For example, by including these, provided with reflection and plan for follow-up, in the Programme Development Plan (or comparable system). The examination board's annual report is involved in consultations between vice-dean of education and programme directors of different programmes within the faculty. If there is reason to do so, examination boards' annual reports can also be involved in bilateral consultations between the dean and Executive Board. This can happen for example if in the context of the Interim Programme Evaluation it is signaled that there are bottlenecks regarding follow-up of examination board signals or recommendations.

Programme Committee annual report

Writing an annual report is not legally required for representative bodies but is good practice. For examination boards, the legislator emphasizes the examination board's independence and transparency with the legal mandate to produce their own annual report. Those same values are also important for representative bodies. Moreover, the annual report is an occasion for representative bodies members to conduct conversation with each other about agenda setting and prioritization, partly with a view to transfer towards the new academic year, and to reflect on working method and collaboration. That conversation can subsequently also be conducted with the programme director following the annual report. Signals or recommendations from a programme committee's annual report can be involved in the internal PDCA at programme level in a comparable manner as described for the examination board. In the context of institution-wide consultation structures for representative bodies, coordinated from Academic Affairs, good practices regarding annual reporting are collected and shared.

7.2 Central instruments

As described in Chapter 5, development and assurance of educational quality at programme level takes shape under the dean's responsibility. Through the instruments of accreditation and TOE, information from the small feedback loops and the programme annual cycle is 'brought upward' every three years. Conversely, outcomes of accreditation and TOE feed agenda setting and prioritization of development themes within the programme annual cycle.

Instrument	Explanation	Roles and responsibilities
Programme accreditation	The six-yearly programme accreditation forms the formal, external validation of educational quality. The main objectives of the instrument are:	• As competent authority, the Executive Board is the formal applicant for accreditations with NVAO. From that responsibility, it is

	• Externally validate that the programme meets legal quality requirements; • Obtain or maintain accreditation for the programme; • Identify improvement points and development opportunities.	closely involved in the programme accreditation process through adoption, after discussion of documents by the AZ account holder with the rector, of successively the programme's information dossier, panel report and development plan in which the programme records follow-up of outcomes. • The programme director is primarily process owner and result-responsible, under governance responsibility of the dean.
--	---	--

Process

1. Timely preparation by programme director according to established planning, including compiling information dossier for panel.
2. Submission of information dossier by dean to Executive Board, adoption by Executive Board.
3. Visit by external visitation panel, resulting in panel report with findings (judgment, improvement points and development opportunities).
4. Submission of panel report by dean to Executive Board, adoption by Executive Board.
5. Formal application by Executive Board to NVAO.
6. Recording of follow-up of findings by programme director in development plan.
7. Submission of development plan by dean to Executive Board, adoption by Executive Board.

Formats and guidelines:

- Process description programme accreditation with accreditation planner
- Checklist information dossier programme accreditation

Instrument	Explanation	Roles and responsibilities
Interim Programme Evaluation (TOE)	The TOE is an internal reflection and evaluation moment halfway through the accreditation cycle. All degree-granting programmes at EUR go through this midterm. TOE 2.0 is the development-oriented form of this midterm review at programme level. The main objectives of the instrument are: • Strengthening autonomy over development and	• The TOE instrument adopted by the Executive Board forms a flexible toolbox that can be deployed within the faculty in a manner that aligns with the own quality assurance system. • Implementation of the TOE process takes place 'under own

	assurance of programme quality; • Developing innovation capacity through targeted approach and action plans; • Strengthening responsiveness and learning capacity of programme and institution.	direction' of the faculty. The programme director is primarily process owner and result-responsible, under governance responsibility of the dean. • After completion of the process, a light screening of the complete dossier takes place by AZ in preparation for a development-oriented governance conversation between the rector and faculty.
--	---	---

Process

TOE 2.0 consists of three components: Quicksan, SOAR (Strengths, Opportunities, Aspirations, Results) analysis, and Development Dialogue.

1. Quicksan: efficient self-check by programme director based on existing documentation to verify that basic quality is in order.
2. Validation of quickscan by representative bodies, examination board, vice-dean of education.
3. SOAR analysis workshop with programme core team in which a targeted, supported development question is formulated that builds on existing strengths.
4. Preparation of development dialogue by programme director, including choice of dialogue form, peers, facilitator and compilation of information dossier.
5. Development dialogue: equal exchange with internal and external peers, resulting in overview of concrete actions for further development.
6. Submission of complete dossier by dean to Executive Board.
7. Development-oriented governance conversation between rector, programme director and (vice-)dean.

Formats and guidelines:

- TOE 2.0 Step-by-step plan, including facilitating toolbox:
 - - Self-assessment quiz: Is your programme ready for a development-oriented midterm?
 - - Quicksan tool
 - - SOAR analysis workshop format
 - - Guidelines for Development Dialogue
 - - Catalogue of Dialogue Forms for Development Dialogue
 - - Briefing for development dialogue participants
 - - Reporting formats for different dialogue forms

8. Management information

Effective quality assurance requires good management information: accessible, reliable and relevant data that provide insight into the quality of education and form the basis for targeted development activities. Within EUR, data availability is organized through a combination of:

- A data portal in central management, with standard reports for different levels and users;
- Customized reports, developed in central management at the request of faculties and/or services;
- Additional reports developed by faculties in own management.

The vertical dialogue between Executive Board and deans is primarily fed from centrally managed reports; decentralized reports can be included in this for additional interpretation. The principle is that these data points can fulfill a signaling function but only truly gain meaning in the context of dialogue.

Development point: management information regarding process and impact indicators

Management information regarding educational quality traditionally focuses on a combination of input indicators (such as student-staff ratio and lecturer qualifications), output indicators (such as percentage of early study leavers and time needed to obtain a diploma) and student satisfaction indicators (such as results of the national student survey and internal course and curriculum evaluations). Alumni research also provides insight into certain impact indicators over longer-term effects (such as functioning in professional practice and career development of alumni).

The systematic collection and disclosure of management information regarding process indicators (about the quality of the learning environment and organization of education, such as teaching methods used) is in development within EUR. For example, in the context of the national KeK pilot (Costs and Quality), exploration is taking place into possibilities for dashboarding information regarding for example group size or teaching and assessment methods and connecting this to a cost calculation of education according to chosen parameters.

As part of strategy implementation, conversation is being held with all faculties about choosing indicators that are specifically relevant in view of our mission-driven impact and engagement ambitions. The previously described instruments being developed from the Evaluating Societal Impact programme can also serve as a good source for this.

EUR Data Portal

The EUR Data Portal is the institution-wide data portal that brings together information on all core activities and supporting processes within EUR in one place. It is developed and managed by the Data Competence Hub (DCH) positioned within the Corporate Planning & Control department. The EUR Data Portal consists of a SharePoint website with links to various reports in Microsoft PowerBI. In the Education Monitor, information is disclosed from available education data sources, for example regarding inflow, study progress and outflow of students at EUR. The Strategy Monitor contains various insights about different strategic themes.

Bilo portal

The bilo portal was developed by the DCH commissioned by Academic Affairs to provide accessible insight into fundamental management information for bilo discussions. For the education domain, this concerns for example growth picture, student satisfaction, earned study credits, lecturer qualifications and study success rate. A reading guide explains attention points in displaying and interpreting quantitative study data and practical tips for

interpreting patterns in the organizational context. In the Teams environment connected to SharePoint, involved representatives from both faculties and AZ can exchange thoughts about the figures.

Data sheet at programme level

As a derivative of available data in the Data Portal, a one-pager data sheet has been developed by AZ in collaboration with the Data-supported work in Education (DOW-OW) programme with a selection of proxy indicators for educational quality at programme level. This is used in dialogue in the context of faculty account management and is included as standard as an appendix to AZ advisory memos to the Executive Board about quality assurance dossiers of the relevant programme. The one-pager also forms the starting point for data screening as part of the quickscan in TOE 2.0. In line with a development-oriented approach, the focus here is not on comparison with other programmes and/or with specific target standards, but on following the figures at programme level over time, with the aim of signaling trends and developments and engaging in conversation about them.

Faculty reports

From the Data-supported work in education (DOW-OW) programme, periodic updates are given to the vice-deans of education consultation on ongoing and completed projects and products that are being developed within the programme context, based on information needs of specific faculties and/or services. With broad positive reception, the relevant product is transferred to the Data Competence Hub for central rollout towards other faculties. Also outside the DOW-OW programme, faculties develop reports and dashboards in own management.

[End of document]